R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 455 JC 670 174

THE GREAT EXPERIMENT--A STUDY OF THE STRUCTURE OF CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION.

BY- GARRIGUS, CHARLES B. AND OTHERS
CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY, SACRAMENTO

REPORT NUMBER CAIR-VOL-10-NO-21 PUB DATE JAN 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.80 70P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *GOVERNANCE, LEGISLATION, *STATE PROGRAMS, STATE GOVERNMENT, TUITION, STUDENT COSTS, SACRAMENTO

THE AUTHORS CONCLUDE THAT THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE FOR CALIFORNIA'S 75 JUNIOR COLLEGES WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IS WEAK AND UNABLE TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP, ALTHOUGH THREE SEPARATE BUREAUS HAVE BEEN SET UP WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT TO COPE WITH MOUNTING STATE-LEVEL PROBLEMS OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES. THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, CHARGED WITH THE DUTY OF SETTING STATE-LEVEL POLICY FOR THE JUNIOR COLLEGES, HAS NEITHER THE TIME NOR THE INCLINATION TO DO THE JOB. THE 1967 LEGISLATURE SHOULD FAVORABLY CONSIDER A BILL TO ESTABLISH A SEPARATE BOARD OF GOVERNORS WHICH WOULD ASSUME THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF JUNIOR COLLEGE POLICY SETTING AND ADMINISTRATION PRESENTLY VESTED IN THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION. LOCAL AUTONOMY, EXERCISED BY LOCALLY ELECTED JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES, SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE OPERATIVE WITHIN THIS FRAMEWORK, PROVIDED THAT THE NEW STATE BODY SHALL POSSESS LEADERSHIP CAPABILITY IN SPEAKING FOR THE JUNIOR COLLEGES ON POLICY MATTERS. THE BOARD SHOULD BE COMPOSED OF 10 MEMBERS, SELECTED BY THE GOVERNOR FOR 10-YEAR STAGGERED TERMS AND CONFIRMED BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE STATE SENATE. THE BOARD SHOULD APPOINT AN ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, A CHANCELLOR, TO SERVE AT THE PLEASURE OF THE BOARD FOR A 4-YEAR TERM. (HS)

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE REPORTS

1965–1967

Volume 10 Number 21

THE GREAT EXPERIMENT

A Study of the Structure of California Higher Education

by the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Assembly Interim Committee on Education

Members of the Subcommittee

Charles B. Garrigus, *Chairman*

Alfred E. Alquist
John L. E. Collier
Houston I. Flournoy
Joe A. Gonsalves
Leroy F. Greene
Stewart Hinckley
Robert T. Monagan
Leo J. Ryan

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

JANUARY 1967

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Michael A. Manley, *Consultant*
Gilbert M. Oster, *Staff Analyst*
Cristine B. Trask, *Secretary*

Walter G. Howald, *Legislative Intern* (September 1965–June 1966)
Bruce W. Robeck, *Legislative Intern* (September 1966–January 1967)

Published by the

ASSEMBLY

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

JESSE M. UNRUH
Speaker

CARLOS BEE
Speaker pro Tempore

GEORGE ZENOVICH
Majority Floor Leader

ROBERT T. MONAGAN
Minority Floor Leader

JAMES D. DRISCOLL
Chief Clerk

ED011455

HC 670 144

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE REPORTS

1965–1967

Volume 10 Number 21

THE GREAT EXPERIMENT

A Study of the Structure of California
Higher Education

by the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Assembly Interim Committee on Education

Members of the Subcommittee

Charles B. Garrigus, *Chairman*

Alfred E. Alquist
John L. E. Collier
Houston I. Flournoy
Joe A. Gonsalves
Leroy F. Greene
Stewart Hinckley
Robert T. Monagan
Leo J. Ryan

JANUARY 1967

Michael A. Manley, *Consultant*
Gilbert M. Oster, *Staff Analyst*
Cristine B. Trask, *Secretary*

Walter G. Howald, *Legislative Intern*
(September 1965–June 1966)
Bruce W. Robeck, *Legislative Intern*
(September 1966–January 1967)

Published by the
ASSEMBLY
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

JESSE M. UNRUH
Speaker

CARLOS BEE
Speaker pro Tempore

GEORGE ZENOVICH
Majority Floor Leader

ROBERT T. MONAGAN
Minority Floor Leader

JAMES D. DRISCOLL
Chief Clerk

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Letter of Transmittal 5

Report of the Subcommittee on Higher Education 7

I. *The Tuition-Free Concept of Public Higher Education:*

- Findings 9
- Recommendations 11
- Introduction 13
- What is Tuition? 14
- Nonresident Tuition 15
- Student Costs 17
- Earnings Foregone 19
- Benefits v. Burdens of Higher Education 20
- Student Financial Aid 29
- The Effects of Tuition in California 33

II. *State-Level Governance of Junior Colleges:*

- Findings 37
- Recommendations 39
- Introduction 41
- The Present Junior College Administrative Structure 41
- Support for the Creation of a Junior College Board 43
- The Subcommittee Proposal 46

III. *The Functions of Teaching and Research in Higher Education:*

- Findings 49
- Recommendations 51
- "The Quality of Teaching is Strained" 53

Separate Views of Assemblyman Leroy F. Greene Relative to the Tuition Issue 61

Statement of Assemblyman John L. E. Collier 62

Appendices 63

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

January 1, 1967

HON. JESSE M. UNRUH
Speaker of the Assembly, and
Members of the Assembly
Assembly Chamber, Sacramento

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to House Resolution 710 of the 1965 General Session of the Legislature and subsequent directives of the Assembly Committee on Rules, the Assembly Interim Committee on Education submits herewith the final report of its Subcommittee on Higher Education.

This report was considered and adopted by the subcommittee listed below and appears in subcommittee report form.

I respectfully commend these recommendations to you for your consideration.

CHARLES B. GARRIGUS, *Chairman*
Assembly Interim Committee
on Education

Subcommittee on Higher Education

GARRIGUS, *Chairman*

ALQUIST
COLLIER
FLOURNOY
GONSALVES
GREENE
HINCKLEY
MONAGAN
RYAN

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

FINAL REPORT OF THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

of the

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE
ON EDUCATION

Members of the Subcommittee

Charles B. Garrigus
Chairman

Alfred E. Alquist
John L. E. Collier ‡
Houston I. Flournoy *
Joe A. Gonsalves
Leroy F. Greene †
Stewart Hinckley ϕ
Robert T. Monagan ‡
Leo J. Ryan §

JANUARY 1967

‡ Assemblymen Collier and Monagan have declined to sign the report. Assemblyman Collier's statement appears with the report.
* Assemblyman Flournoy concurs in the report, but with the exceptions noted herein.
† Assemblyman Greene concurs in the report, but dissents to several points made herein. His statement appears with the report.
ϕ Assemblyman Hinckley concurs generally with the report, but feels that a modest tuition charge is warranted.
§ Assemblyman Ryan concurs in all but Part II of the report, dealing with governance of junior colleges.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

2—L-1803

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TUITION-FREE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

FINDINGS

1. The committee finds that, contrary to popular opinion in California, public higher education in this state is *not* free by any means at the present time, and there is even serious doubt as to whether it is tuition-free. This is true because the University of California and the California State Colleges include in their incidental and materials and services fees, charges for items normally thought to be of an "instructional" nature. Since tuition is defined as a charge designed to cover the cost of instruction, to the extent that these so-called fees cover such costs, they constitute a partial, although unacknowledged tuition.

2. In addition to direct, out-of-pocket costs, we find that there are substantial living and foregone earning costs involved in the attendance at a California public institution of higher education.

3. Because of the heavy financial burdens involved in attending California's "free" colleges and university, we find that the upper and middle income segments of the California population are represented in attendance at the state university and colleges out of all proportion to the representation from the lower income levels. In effect, we find that California's "tuition free" policy—as presently constituted—subsidizes the education of students able to pay for it but does nothing for insuring a higher education opportunity for those students unable to pay. In short, we find that the statements made in recent years by many public and university officials, that California's higher education system assures equal opportunity to all, regardless of their financial ability, not to be based on fact.

4. The committee finds that resident student fees at California's public institutions have increased sharply in recent years, and we suspect that this is true in part because of fears on the part of higher education officials that if this were not done, the Legislature would itself impose a tuition charge.

5. We find that nonresident students at these public institutions are charged a significant amount of tuition, which fairly represents the cost of instruction, but that overly large numbers of them then have this tuition waived. We believe that a small number of out-of-state tuition waivers are reasonable, but not to the extent that such waivers become numerous and thereby result in a lowering of educational quality, and state tax dollars available, for California resident students.

6. The committee finds that state scholarship funds are not nearly numerous or generous enough to make more than a small dent in the need for financial help to assist needy and able college students to continue their schooling. We further find that the need for subsistence grants—in addition to present scholarship funds which may cover tuition, fees and books only—is pressing.

7. We find that far more intensive effort is needed on the part of state government and the public institutions themselves to induce stu-

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

dents from economically depressed environments who may have the capability to succeed in college (even though they may not have the necessary secondary school grades) to enroll in our public institutions. The number of such students now enrolled in California higher education is shockingly low, and these statistics indicate a tremendous loss of talent to California and to the nation. We believe that the federal government's "Project Upward Bound," implemented under a less well-known provision of the Economic Opportunity Act, marks a beginning in recapturing some of this lost talent.

8. The committee finds that the concept of a moderate tuition charge for California higher education lacks the dire consequences predicted for it by many public officials and university and college leaders, and may even have beneficial effects of evening out the socioeconomic differences among students at the state's public colleges, *provided* that such a moderate tuition is combined with substantial increases in scholarship and subsistence funds available to needy students. In addition, we believe that the concept of a moderate tuition, with all or a portion to be waived depending upon student and/or family income, should be closely studied.

However, because such a policy would have important implications for occupational talents—the supply of, and demand for, the skills produced through a higher education—in California and in the rest of the nation, we suggest that much more serious and objective study is needed before such a policy is adopted here.

9. The committee finds that a plan of deferred tuition, payable after graduation on a varying basis dependent upon income of the graduate, while attractive on its face, could create serious administrative problems for state government, and far more serious difficulties through a possible upset of the balance of occupations and professions which graduates might seek to enter.

10. Regardless of the merits of a moderate tuition charge, the committee finds that it would *not* produce the large new state revenues which some of its advocates predict it would, particularly if it is combined with increased scholarship funds and/or tuition waivers. We believe that henceforth tuition should not be looked upon primarily as a revenue raiser, but rather as an equalizer in terms of educational opportunity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee Recommends That:

1. Because of the overriding and as yet unanswered questions of the effect of a moderate tuition charge on the mix of occupational skills produced by a higher education, together with unsolved problems of the effect upon supply and demand of certain essential professions, which have greatly varying income expectations (such as teachers, medical doctors, public health specialists, engineers, etc.) the question of the institution of a moderate tuition charge in California public higher education should be deferred until it can be studied in depth by the Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California Legislature. It is our understanding that the macroeconomic study of higher education in this state planned by this joint committee is directed at answering some of these questions, and that consequently this study should be allowed to proceed to its conclusion before the Legislature makes a final determination on the tuition question.

2. Future increases in the incidental fee of the University of California and the materials and services fee of the California State Colleges should be reported to the Legislature through the education committees of the Assembly and the Senate prior to their adoption by the regents and trustees, together with a factual breakdown of the composition of such fee increases and a justification therefor. Legislation to this end should be enacted by the 1967 Legislature.

3. Legislation should be enacted by the 1967 Legislature to fulfill one major unimplemented provision of the Master Plan for Higher Education which would provide that a program of subsistence grants be made available, in addition to the present state scholarships, to award winners on the basis of their financial need. Such a program should be administered by the State Scholarship and Loan Commission and should be instituted initially on a pilot basis with no more than 500 such subsistence grants awarded each year, to be financed with an initial state appropriation of approximately $250,000.

4. Action should be taken by the Legislature to provide support for the inducement of qualified students from lower socioeconomic levels to enroll in public higher education through the enactment of legislation similar to Assembly Bill 2830 (Soto) of the 1965 General Session which would create a "college opportunity grant scholarship program" specifically aimed at this group. We note that this legislation was endorsed by the State Scholarship and Loan Commission in 1965, and is financially responsible in that it proposes a program initially limited to 250 such grants annually, at a state cost in 1967 of $80,000.

5. Proposals for a deferred tuition, payable after graduation on a variable payment plan dependent upon the graduate's earning capacity (similar to AB 600—Collier, 1965 General Session), should not be adopted because of the serious administrative difficulties and financial hardships which such proposals might cause, together with as yet unknown effects which such plans could have upon inducing students to enter higher paying occupations in favor of lower paying ones, and in recognition of the "negative dowry" effects which such plans could have.

TUITION-FREE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

Introduction

The major efforts of this subcommittee during the 1965–1967 biennium were devoted to the first thorough legislative study of the effects which the adoption of a formalized tuition charge for public higher education might have upon that education system and the state as a whole. To that end a series of public hearings was conducted by the subcommittee in various parts of the state, substantial staff studies were made, and respected higher education leaders, scholars and economists were called upon to assist in the deliberations.

The committee has concluded, after the submission of considerable evidence on both sides, that the imposition of a formal tuition charge in California public higher education—while it certainly lacks many of the dire effects predicted for it by many people—would be unwise at this time. In making this major recommendation, we do not foreclose the possibility that at some undetermined time in the near future—after further study—California might be warranted in instituting such a charge, provided that it is moderate and selectively applied depending upon a student's financial status. However, the broader implications of tuition—especially upon the mix of occupational skills produced by our institutions of higher learning—bear much closer scrutiny than this subcommittee was able to give. In this sense, we note that the Joint Committee on Higher Education, established by the 1965 Legislature to study the development of the Master Plan for Higher Education, is apparently embarking on precisely the economics-based type of study which we have in mind. We have, therefore, concluded that this joint committee should be allowed to complete its report to the Legislature at its 1969 session before any final action is taken relative to the establishment of a tuition charge for California public higher education.

Nevertheless, we hope our study dispels many of the myths which are current regarding the dangers and the benefits inherent in the tuition concept. We have also proposed several substantive programs aimed at insuring more equal entry for students from all economic and racial backgrounds into the mainstream of public higher education in this state. We urge the 1967 Legislature to take early action on these recommendations.

The Master Plan for Higher Education approved by the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education in 1960 contained the following statement:

> The two governing boards reaffirm the long-established principle that state colleges and the University of California shall be tuition-free to all residents of the state.

In the six years since this formal approval, the tuition-free policy for resident students has been questioned on several occasions. For ex-

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

ample, bills to establish a deferred tuition program were introduced in the State Legislature in 1963, 1964, and 1965. Although these measures did not pass either house of the Legislature, their introduction indicates serious interest in the possibility of instituting a resident tuition to help cover the costs of California higher education. Introduction of this legislation also raises many corollary policy questions concerning the results of California's free tuition policy, the sociological impact of imposing a resident tuition, and alternative courses of action available to the Legislature.

The 1965 proposals were referred to the Assembly Committee on Education for interim study. By way of further introduction, it is important to note that while most of the arguments for and against instituting tuition are expressed in economic terms which appear susceptible to relatively objective analysis, the final resolution of these arguments will necessarily be subject to the philosophic orientation of the decision makers. The reason for this is that juxtaposition of the relative economic and social gains of higher education to society and to the student discloses, on the one hand, the costs of higher education to society can be considered a financial investment that has produced a substantial addition to national income and general welfare, and, on the other hand, the costs of this same education to the student generally have been reimbursed in future lifetime earnings and/or social position.

What Is Tuition?

An important distinction must be made at the outset between student tuition and student fees at California's higher education institutions. Tuition is generally defined as a charge collected from students to be applied to cover the direct costs of classroom instruction. Student fees are collected to cover expenses other than the cost of instruction. Although there is presently no charge for tuition for residents of the state who are enrolled as undergraduates in the regular academic sessions of any of the state's public higher education institutions, students are required to pay several fees for services which are incidental or auxiliary to classroom instruction. As might be anticipated, we have found substantial confusion in maintaining the distinction between tuition for instructional costs and fees to cover noninstructional costs. This confusion is evident in expressions and writings of students, the parents who pay these fees, and in the opinions of some out-of-state writers on the tuition-free policy in California. Much of this confusion may be directly attributable to some historical fragments of tuition in California. For example, from 1933 to 1953 the state colleges openly charged a small "tuition" fee, and statutory authorization for a limited tuition charge ($25) has been carried over (Education Code Section 23753) from the organic act establishing the first state college in 1862. The university charged tuition only during its initial months of operation in 1869, but the Education Code continues to carry a vestigial reference to a "rate of tuition" to be determined by the regents (Education Code Section 23051). Moreover, both the university and the state colleges now allocate a portion of their incidental fee income, collected from both resident and nonresident students, to laboratory and other instructional mate-

rials which might otherwise be considered as part of direct teaching expense and, therefore, tuition. In this sense, then, there is now a partial tuition in these institutions. Despite the confusion over the distinction between tuition and student fees to cover noninstructional costs, it is still noteworthy to remember that present fees charged the California resident undergraduate for regular session public higher education are intended to cover only costs for the addition or continuation of noninstructional services to the student.

Tuition is charged a number of categories of students attending California's higher education institutions. Some graduate students (e.g., medical students) pay a form of tuition in that they are assessed additional fees to cover portions of the costs of special materials necessary in their study. The extension and summer session programs at both the university and state colleges collect a per-unit student charge intended to cover the full costs of these programs (except for a small state contribution to university extension). Junior colleges maintaining classes for adults may charge tuition for these classes as provided by Education Code Section 5757. Confusion sometimes arises concerning the "out-of-district" tuition junior colleges assess to cover the cost of education of nonresident student. However, such payments are not assessed against these students but are assessed against the tax-collecting authority of the area in which the student resides. The actual amount and the payment procedure is negotiated between the junior college district or county in which the student resides and the junior college district he wishes to attend. This method of pulling together appropriate revenues and costs has not been used to eliminate or reduce the nonresident tuition charged the out-of-state student, but it appears to be at least theoreticaly possible. In 1965, Section 23758.2 of the Education Code was enacted to permit the state colleges to enter into interstate college agreements for the exchange of students so the students do not have to pay nonresident tuition at either state's institution.

Nonresident Tuition

By far the largest category of students paying a tuition charge for California public higher education is the out-of-state "nonresident" student. Education Code Sections 23054, 23756, and 25505 in essence define a resident student as one who has been a bona fide resident of the state for at least one year immediately preceding the opening day of the semester during which he proposes to attend a state college, junior college, or the university. Those students who are not "resident students" under this definition must pay a tuition charge to cover "average teaching costs." The Master Plan for Higher Education defined teaching costs:

> ". . . to include the cost of the salaries of the instructors involved in teaching for the proportion of their time which is concerned with instruction, plus the clerical salaries, supplies, equipment, and organized activities related to teaching."

Generally, the nonresident tuition at all three segments of public higher education is set with reference to the instructional costs per student. With regard to the university and state colleges, the master plan defined these instruction costs as not less than the state's contribution to the average teaching expense per student.

Since the repeal in 1961 of the $500-per-year statutory limit on nonresident tuition at the university (Education Code Section 23053) the regents have increased this tuition several times to the present $800 per year. A minimum nonresident tuition of $360 per year for state colleges is prescribed by Section 23754 of the Education Code. The Board of Trustees of the State Colleges is empowered to increase its nonresident tuition and has done so. State colleges presently charge out-of-state students $600 per year and foreign students the legal maximum of $255 per year. In 1963, Section 25505.5 (now 25505.8) of the Education Code was enacted and directed the State Board of Education to set, year to year, a nonresident tuition on a uniform "cost of instruction" basis for all the state's junior colleges. The 1965–66 junior college nonresident tuition has been set at $309 per year for 30 units of classes (i.e., $10.30 per unit).

The preceding facts concerning nonresident tuition should be read with some supplemental qualifications. First, there are many opportunities for nonresident students to avoid paying the tuition charge. All three branches of higher education are empowered to grant waivers, several statutory exemptions from the charge are available, and the possibility of obtaining financial help through student aid programs is rapidly expanding.

In fact, as the nonresident tuition has been increased, there has been a general corollary increase of opportunities either to void or receive assistance in meeting this charge. Legislation in 1965 did somewhat reduce these opportunities by a percentage limitation on the number of nonresident tuition waivers available (Budget Act of 1965). Secondly, as evidenced by Table 1, nonresident tuition increases during the past decade have not halted a continual increase in the percentage of nonresident enrollment to total enrollment. This is not to say that

Table 1

NONRESIDENT TUITION-ENROLLMENT TRENDS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Year (fall semester)	Nonresident tuition fee	Nonresident enrollment	Total enrollment	Col. (3) as percent of (4)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1954	300	3,949	35,273	11.2
1955	300	4,482	38,594	11.6
1956	300	4,944	40,313	12.3
1957	300	5,488	42,039	13.1
1958	400	6,068	43,478	14.0
1959	500	6,289	44,878	14.0
1960	500	7,267	49,169	14.8
1961	500	8,278	54,267	15.3
1962	500	9,360	58,616	16.0
1963	600	10,727	64.504	16.6
1964	600	12,010	71,267	16.85
1965	800	N.A.	79,449	N.A.

N.A.: Not available at this time.
Source: The University of California, Office of the University Dean of Educational Relations, Berkeley.

these tuition increases have not had an impact upon the socioeconomic composition of nonresident enrollment. In fact, it is generally conceded that any increase in costs of education which is not accompanied by some form of student aid, waiver of tuition, etc., will adversely affect those students from low income families. The figures for 1965 will be of more than passing interest since both the largest rise in nonresident tuition is in effect this year and tuition waivers have been limited for the first time.

The fact that nonresident tuition is calculated with reference to "instructional costs" and that the nonresident student also pays the "noninstructional" fees assessed all students does not mean the nonresident student is no expense to the state. The reason for what cursorily appears to be no discrepancy lies in the fact that all functions carried on by higher education institutions are not included within the definitional purview of "instructional" and "noninstructional." Thus, expenses for such items as capital outlay, research and administration are not generally covered by any student charge revenues. The largest number (12,010), as well as the largest percentage of nonresident enrollment to total enrollment (16.85 percent) exists at the university. Yet the estimated revenue from nonresident tuition will cover less than 25 percent of total university expenditures related to instruction of nonresident students during 1965–66.[1] The 1965 legislation reducing the waiver allotment for each campus will only slightly affect this percentage since the estimated average cost per student for instruction-related university expenditures is $1,867 and the nonresident tuition charge is $800 for 1965–66.

On the other hand, the number of nonresidents and the percentage of nonresident enrollment to total enrollment at state colleges and junior colleges is substantially lower than for the university. And the estimated average cost per student to instruction-related expenditures at these institutions is also much lower than that of the university, so the nonresident student pays tuition which covers a much higher percentage of the state college and junior college expenditures related to instruction of their nonresident students.

Fourthly, nonresident tuition, as well as resident tuition policies, must be considered in comparison to similar fees charged by other states' institutions and private institutions. The interstate and intrastate flow of students is obviously affected by tuition and fee charges at many educational institutions within the United States.

Student Costs

California's tuition-free policy does not mean that education is provided at no cost to the student. We have found that for both resident and nonresident students, there are a number of types of fees designed to cover at least a portion of the cost of providing specific services to the student. The levels of most of these fees are shown in Table 2.

The incidental fee at the university, or the materials and services fee as it is called at the state colleges, is intended to cover the direct costs of student health services, counseling and testing, housing services, job placement services, diplomas and certificates, and laboratory and other instructional materials. For the university, the incidental

[1] Analysis of the Budget Bill, Report of the Legislative Analyst to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, 1965 Regular Session, p. 352.

Table 2

BASIC STUDENT FEES FOR THE YEAR 1965–66

	University of California	California State Colleges	Junior colleges
Incidental fee or materials and services fee	$200	$76	
Parking	16–72	26	$10
Room and Board	800–958	450–830	400–720
Application Fee	5–10	5	0–2
Student Union Fee	5–25	2	
Student Activities Fee	11–30	10–25	20
Transcript, petition and Penalty Fees	1–10	1–5	0–2

Source: 1965 Report of the Legislative Analyst—Analysis of Budget Bill, page 296; and 1965–66 catalogs of the colleges.

fee is also expected to meet deficits in intercollegiate activities, subsidize certain student cultural programs, and provide for the amortization of proposed capital outlay for new student facilities, including student health, recreational, and intercollegiate athletic facilities. The university's incidental fee has risen from $120 to $220 over the four-year period from 1961–62 to 1964–65, in large part because of the university's decision to finance a greater portion of the cost of student centers, cultural activities and recreational facilities from this source.

As was mentioned earlier, there has been much confusion over both the incidental fee and the materials and services fee. Whether a meaningful distinction between "tuition" and "fee" can be maintained appears to be moot in the minds of many—both tuition and fees represent an expense to the parent and student which must be borne in order to utilize the state's higher educational facilities. The estimated allocation of the university's incidental fee revenues for 1965–66 is approximately 20 percent for capital outlay and debt services, and 80 percent for student services, cultural activities and recreation. At the state colleges, revenues from the materials and services fee are budgeted at approximately 40 percent for instructional operating expense (expendable classroom supplies and materials and laboratory expenses) and 60 percent for student services. If a tuition were charged resident students, it appears highly desirable to alter the present status of the incidental fee and materials and services fee, or at least to clarify the definitional delineation between fee and tuition—if such a distinction is to be retained at all.

The junior colleges do not charge a fee similar to the incidental or the materials and services fee. They are authorized to charge up to $10 per year for student health and for the use of parking facilities. Few, if any, junior colleges have student health services at this time. Both the university and state colleges levy a direct charge for the use of their parking facilities. At the university this parking charge varies greatly among campuses according to the availability of parking facilities.

The figures in Table 2 for room and board are for the residence halls, when available, at the various public campuses. These figures do not necessarily reflect the average paid for room and board, but only indicate the approximate cost to the student for the use of the

school-provided facilities. Only 13 of 75 junior colleges have any room and board facilities.

Other student fees include application fees charged against the processing costs for initial admission applications, student union, or activity fees, primarily for the construction and operation of student centers and support of intercollegiate athletics, and transcript, petition, and various penalty fees charged to cover the administration costs created by the late registrant, requests for several school transcripts, dropping or adding classes, etc. Very few of the junior colleges levy any fees of this type.

Obviously the preceding discussion of student tuition and fees does not include all elements of student expense. Student tuition and fees encompass only that portion of student expense which is directly levied on the student by the state's educational institutions. However, any consideration of the tuition policy in California must not ignore the total direct economic burden borne by the student and/or his parents. The on-campus resident student at the university can expect to spend almost $1,800 per year for his fees, living expenses, books and supplies, and limited social life. The same student at either a junior college or state college will spend between $1,400 and $1,600 to cover similar expenses. The student who commutes to a campus of any of the three segments of public higher education will spend between $400 and $600 less than his on-campus counterpart. These figures compare with the statewide average for private higher education institution student expenses of about $2,700 per year. The average student in California will be able to save from summer earnings between $300 and $500 to apply against his expenses for the next school year. It should be noted that all of these expense and earning figures are considered in determining the availability and amount of any loan or scholarship funds offered each student applying for such assistance.

Earnings Foregone

From a purely economic point of view, some would argue that living expenses such as room and board, clothes, laundry, etc., should be excluded from the costs of education to students and their parents on the rationale that young people have to be fed, clothed and sheltered whether they are in school or not. To the extent the preceding estimates for expenses per student include subsistence, this view may be correct, but it certainly is incorrect to assume that going to school requires no greater outlay for living expenses than subsistence, if the student is to receive the full measure of formal education offered to him at the higher educational institution. However, there is one expense seldom formally recognized in computing costs of education to students but considered by many economists as a proper cost of higher education—the contribution to national income and the students' personal incomes which young people would have garnered if they had been working instead of studying. This is a real cost, not only to the students but to the economy which is deprived of a production, roughly measured by the students' foregone earnings, when part of the potential labor force is in school.

This concept of earnings foregone as a cost of education is extremely important to a thorough analysis of higher education finance. As one

example, if earnings foregone were excluded, studies of lifetime earning differentials associated with levels of education indicate a very high rate of return for what college students have been paying for their education when this rate is compared to the return on alternative investments. The inclusion of earnings foregone in the estimates of all costs of education (including both public and private schools) reduces education's estimated rate of return by almost 60 percent.

Considerable economic literature has been published to aid in developing careful techniques for selecting appropriate data for the calculation of earnings foregone. Theodore Schultz, a pioneer in the field of measuring economic benefits and costs of education, offers one set of estimates of earnings foregone per student.[2] Schultz estimates in 1956, for example, that a college student's foregone earnings amounted to $1,943 for the months he spent in school. From the standpoint of the individual student and his family, this cost is a real expense of higher education in addition to the direct costs of fees, tuition, living expenses, etc. Considered from the point of view of society as a whole, earnings foregone represent a loss in national income which must be accounted for as an investment in the future.

The Benefits vs. the Burdens of Higher Education

Few would doubt that education is beneficial to the individual and to the state as a whole. However, estimates as to both the degree to which higher education produces these benefits and the specific benefits received by the individual in contrast to the state remain controversial. Herein lies a good portion of the discussion over tuition vs. tuition-free: since education benefits both the individual and the state as a whole, should both bear the burden of the cost of education and, if so, in what proportion to each other should each bear this cost? Answers must obviously come from the decision maker, but it is helpful to classify the benefits received by the state and the individual student.

Higher education may benefit the state in any number of ways, but for clarity, four general classifications are suggested. First, the political institutions in the United States are founded upon the belief that the electorate will be intelligent enough to make informed decisions on matters it faces. California is especially committed to this educated electorate. Widespread use of the initiative and referendum necessitates an intelligent electorate. The complex problems created by this state's phenomenal growth demand an informed, ducated citizenry. As our problems become more complex, a college educated electorate becomes a greater asset for California's progress.

Secondly, in recent years higher education has become a major vehicle to upward social mobility. Providing accessible higher education opportunities for all individuals to reach their full potential necessarily benefits employment in the state as well as social well-being.

Thirdly, higher education provides a laboratory for research to achieve more informed solutions to the state's problems as well as providing the state with its potential future leaders.

Fourthly, the state's economy progressively improves as more of its citizens receive college education. Heretofore, the analysis of economic growth has involved the study of land, labor and physical capital—i.e.,

[2] Nelson B. Henry, ed., part 2, Social Forces Influencing American Education, 1961.

the conventional factors of production. However, growth in these factors does not explain either why the national income has been increasing at a much higher rate than the combined amount of land, man-hours and stock of reproducible capital used in producing income, or why there continues to be substantial increases in real earnings of workers. At least one major source of such economic growth is the effect of schooling upon the productivity of human effort. Edward F. Denison in "The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States and the Alternatives Before Us" (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1962), estimates that 21 percent of the economic growth of the United States between 1929 and 1957 is attributable to the increase in schooling of the labor force. According to Theodore Schultz, this increase in amount of schooling per member of the labor force accounted for an increase in national income between 1929 and 1956 of at least $25.7 billion.

The importance of higher education to the state's economic growth is also evident from labor force distribution statistics. Without reviewing in detail the literature on this subject, it will suffice to point out the type of growth, as well as the pace of growth, of the nation and state will depend upon the composition of the personnel supply available in the future. The trends are toward employment requiring higher education backgrounds. Thus, for the state to benefit from such employment trends, the state must offer more and more opportunity for higher education. We have found that few of the advocates of imposing a tuition charge at California schools and colleges have taken this factor into consideration. Such a study is beyond the scope and ability of this committee, but we strongly believe that thorough study must be given to the effects of tuition on the type of skills and professions represented in the California economy before tuition is established. Clearly, if tuition resulted, for instance, in a drastic reduction in the number of students entering premedicine or predental work (where tuition based upon cost of instruction would be comparatively high) in favor of a sharp increase in the numbers of students entering business administration (where tuition would be lower), its imposition might not be advisable. This matter should be thoroughly investigated by the Joint Committee on Higher Education before a tuition is imposed.

Finally, the state benefits from higher education in a number of immeasurable ways which are perhaps best described as "consumption benefits" by Burton A. Weisbrod, "Education and the Investment in Human Capital" (*Journal of Political Economy, Supplement,* October 1962). Such benefits as "present well-being," "cultural participation," "intellectual reinforcement of moral values," etc., are included in this general classification of consumption benefits. Weisbrod points out that the state benefits from consumption benefits because in practice, much of the future consumption benefits of schooling is "captured" by others in that a person's schooling presumably improves the well-being of his neighbors, his employer and co-workers and is generally diffused in society. Of course, the most direct monetary diffusion of the benefits of higher education to the society is facilitated through the government, since the usually higher income of the more educated portion of the society may come under the levy of one of the taxing powers.

For the most part, the benefits of higher education to the individual parallel the benefits mentioned above as accruing to the state. The individual student benefits financially, as does the state, and the student receives many noneconomic benefits similar to the state's political, social, cultural, etc., benefits.

The noneconomic benefits of higher education that accrue to the student are intangible and perhaps immeasurable, but are, nevertheless, real and are considered by the individual in evaluating his education. Higher education gives the individual a great amount of social mobility, allowing him opportunities for higher employment positions. According to a study by C. A. Anderson in the *American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. 66, 1961, pp. 360–70, this mobility benefit has proved especially valuable to youth from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. In addition, a higher education is increasingly regarded as a prerequisite for attaining personal goals such as social prestige, lifetime pursuit of cultural interests, and a substantial basis for successful family life. Weisbrod defines and classifies a number of higher education benefits. Generally, he discusses benefits such as increased job flexibility, additional schooling opportunities, abilities to save expenses because the individual can do things himself (e.g., make out one's own tax return), and the security gained from attaining higher skill levels.

In addition to the noneconomic benefits, the individual student generally attains a higher lifetime earnings level by obtaining a college degree. Herman P. Miller of the U.S. Bureau of the Census produced one of the more recent comparisons of education and lifetime earnings shown in Table 3.

Table 3

EDUCATION AND LIFETIME EARNINGS: MEN

(Earnings from age 18 to 64)

Highest grade completed	Earnings
All education groups	$229,000
Elementary School:	
Less than 8 years	143,000
8 years	184,000
High School:	
1 to 3 years	212,000
4 years	274,000
College:	
1 to 3 years	293,000
4 years	385,000
5 years or more	455,000

Source: Based on 1960 census figures U.S. Senate, 88th Congress, 1st Session, hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Bills Relating to Equal Employment Opportunities, July and August 1963, p. 335.

However, the averages shown by Table 3 conceal wide variations in income. The fact is that many fail to profit financially from their higher education. For example, the income pattern for those with one to three years of college parallels that of high school graduates rather

than college four-year graduates. There are great variations in earnings among the professions and between men and women. And a study by Miller using 1950 census data shows that education has less effect upon income for nonwhites than for whites. It should also be remembered that education is only one of many factors determining income. Even without a college education, superior intelligence, better home environment and greater social and economic opportunities, can result in higher earnings. However, recent studies by James Morgan and Martin David in "Education and Income" (*The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 1963, pp. 423–37, conclude that:

> ". . . education remains a powerful determinant of earnings. The effect of education on earnings is not a fictitious result of spurious correlations involving other factors like parental influences."

Of course, the benefits of higher education to the state and the individual are not obtained without corollary sacrifices and costs to both the state and the individual student. It is axiomatic that every benefit has a corollary burden, but it is not so well recognized that both the state and student carry the higher education burden. Nor is it always remembered that the education burden has an infinite number of economic and sociologic effects, depending upon the socioeconomic complexion of the particular individual or segment of society which is called upon to carry this burden. Therefore, it is necessary not only to consider what the burden of education is, but also who should shoulder it if it is reallocated or as it increases in the future.

This report is not intended to present an exhaustive survey of higher education financing in California. Several recent reports, mentioned in the following text, have considered the subject in detail. Here, the committee's purpose is to only outline briefly what appears to be the factual basis for a consideration of the state's higher education burdens.

Generally, the costs of public higher education are borne by the state, local school districts, and parents and/or the students. The state's General Fund is the primary dollar contributor to the state colleges and university, while local school districts in large part support the public junior colleges.

The primary sources of state revenues used to support higher education are those taxes channeled into the State General Fund. Under the existing tax structure, the proportion of General Fund revenue from each state tax category is shown in Table 4. Basically, these taxes are regressive taxes, as shown by the combined "percentage take" figures correlated to the income levels of taxpayers shown in Table 5. It should be noted that the regressive nature of these state taxes is probably understated in Table 5 since the federal income tax take was discounted from income before the effective tax rate was computed. The unusual upturn for the $15,000 and over bracket in Table 5 is a result of the highly progressive federal income tax drastically lowering the income figures—thus, the progressive state income tax appears to take an increased percentage of the net income.

Table 5 is comparable to Table 6 which illustrates the regressive nature of the local property tax that supports the junior colleges.

Table 4

STATE GENERAL FUND TAX REVENUES

(in millions)

Taxes, fees, etc.	Estimated revenues, 1965–66	Distribution, in percent
Sales and use	$1,022.1	42
Tobacco	174.0	7
Alcoholic beverage	78.0	3
Personal income	392.2	16
Bank and corporation	423.0	17
Inheritance and gift	113.1	5
Insurance	103.3	4
Horseracing	39.6	2
Other sources	92.2	4
Totals, General Fund	$2,437.4	100

Source: State of California Support and Local Assistance Budget for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966, p. A-9.

Table 5

EFFECTIVE TAX RATE (STATE GENERAL FUND) BASED ON FAMILY PERSONAL INCOME AFTER FEDERAL INCOME TAXES

Income bracket	Effective tax rate per $100 (combined taxes)
Less than $2,000	$4.41
$2,000– 2,999	3.52
3,000– 3,999	3.74
4,000– 4,999	3.22
5,000– 5,999	3.32
6,000– 6,999	3.64
7,000– 9,999	3.36
10,000–14,999	3.23
15,000 and over	6.84

Source: Assembly Interim Committee on Revenue and Taxation, Taxation of Property in California (staff report to the committee), December 1964.

Tables 5 and 6, derived from the staff report to the Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation, "Taxation of Property in California," December 1964, indicate that those taxes which finance public higher education in California are especially regressive in their combined impact. It thus appears the lower income classes are bearing the greatest burden in financing the public costs of higher education. The "Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960–1975" recommended that the state, through its General Fund, undertake 45 percent of the junior college expenditures by 1975. Such an undertaking may significantly reduce the burden on those in lower income brackets if the regressive local property tax now supporting junior colleges were reduced. However, reduction or elimination of the property tax would not remove all the burden from the lower income classes, since most

Table 6

EFFECTIVE TAX RATE (PROPERTY TAX) BASED ON FAMILY PERSONAL INCOME AFTER FEDERAL INCOME TAXES

Income bracket	Effective tax rate per $100
Less than $2,000	$9.21
$2,000– 2,999	10.44
3,000– 3,999	9.05
4,000– 4,999	.99
5,000– 5,999	7.42
6,000– 6,999	7.03
7,000– 9,999	6.19
10,000–14,999	5.01
15,000 and over	5.63

Source: Assembly Interim Committee on Revenue and Taxation, Taxation of Property in California (staff report to the committee), December 1964.

of the taxes supporting the General Fund are also regressive. In addition, the regressive nature of General Fund taxes indicates that any increase in lifetime earnings attributable to higher education probably is not recaptured by state taxes as a reimbursement to the public for its investment in higher education. This, of course, is not to say such increased earnings are not recaptured by the progressive federal income tax, to the extent federal revenues are returned to support state higher education.

As a frame of reference for evaluating the combined state and local tax burden carried in California, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education made a comparative study of the efforts and burdens of a number of other states.[3] The comparison with nine populous high income states indicated that California in 1961-62 exceeded six of them in its overall tax burden. Since most of these states have much of their higher education carried by private institutions, a second group of 10 states was selected, all of which are similar to California in their preponderance of higher education enrollments accommodated in public institutions. All of this second group exceeded California in their overall tax burden, but three failed to match California's effort in public higher education expenditures.

The preceding discussion of the state and local tax burdens incurred for higher education is not exhaustive in two respects. First, it presents a very simplified outline of what the state and local districts now face in financing higher education and, therefore, it does not touch upon a number of important financing items, such as the use of bonding to finance capital outlay. Secondly, it does not include the very important burden placed upon the state by the fact that a large portion of the potential labor force is in school—i.e., "productivity foregone" because young people are in college. In the preceding section on student tuition, fees, and expenses, the concept of earnings foregone was mentioned as a "cost" to the student. It is important at least to recognize that this same "Earnings foregone" represents a burden

[3] *An Evaluation of the Tuition-Free Principle in California Public Higher Education*, May 1965, p. 19.

on the state's economy, as well as the student's income, since the state foregoes an increment of production whenever members of its population are not in the labor force.

Of course, the state does not shoulder all of the burdens of higher education. The student and his family are confronted with a number of economic adjustments and sacrifices whenever college education is sought. The actual expenditures incurred by the student at a public higher education institution have been discussed previously in this report. The important concept of earnings foregone has been mentioned several times previously in our report. What is of primary importance in considering the burden of higher education on the student and/or his family is who actually incurs the student's higher education expenses, and what is the economic position of those who pay for these expenses. The answers to these questions are crucial and considerable attention must be given them if a reasonable decision on tuition policies in California higher education is to be made. Fortunately, a major study has been made by Edward Sanders and Hans Palmer for the California State Scholarship Commission.[4]

The Sanders and Palmer study was based on a survey of some 6,200 California undergraduate resident students attending the various segments, both private and public, of California higher education. Parents completed 77 percent of the questionnaires on behalf of their dependent children and self-supporting students responded directly to the remaining 23 percent. From these response figures, it is evident the burden of the student's expenses falls upon his or her family, though Sanders and Palmer do indicate there are a great number of self-supporting students. Thus, it is important to note the income levels of families with children in college in evaluating the incidence of financial burden placed upon these families.

Table 7 indicates that almost 55 percent of the parents of college students had incomes between $8,000 and $20,000 annually. The median value of their incomes was between $11,000 and $12,000 a year, placing these families very definitely in the more affluent portion of California's population. As indicated by Table 7, about 22 percent of the parents of children in private universities had incomes of $25,000 or more, and over 50 percent had incomes of $14,000 or more, making this the wealthiest group of college parents. The next most affluent groups were the parents of students in the private colleges and private denominational colleges. While the families of the students at the university appear to have a similar income distribution to that of the parents of students in nondenominational private colleges, the lowest income group ($0 to $1,999) at the university included five times as many parents as did the private colleges. In percentage, the university's low income group exceeded all other higher education segments. Parents of junior college students are shown as the least affluent group since about 23 percent of these parents had incomes of below $6,000 a year and there were fewer junior college parents in the upper brackets.

The income distribution for the self-supporting segment of student enrollment in California is shown in Table 8.

---

[4] *The Financial Barrier to College Attendance in California*, 1964.

Table 7

PARENTAL INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Income class	Junior college	State college	University of California	Private University	Private college	Private college—Denominational	4-year Special
	percent	percent	percent	percent	percent	percent	percent
$0–$1,999	1.6	.7	2.9	.5	.5	.7	1.4
2,000– 3,999	6.2	3.3	2.0	1.3	2.9	4.1	3.5
4,000– 5,999	15.4	10.0	7.4	4.9	5.8	8.7	7.2
6,000– 7,999	19.0	16.6	11.0	6.5	11.7	13.9	13.1
8,000– 9,999	16.4	16.8	12.9	10.1	12.4	16.4	10.8
10,000–11,999	13.9	19.5	13.1	10.4	13.3	14.5	10.0
12,000–13,999	7.0	10.5	11.2	11.7	13.8	12.8	8.1
14,000–19,999	10.7	12.7	20.0	16.7	18.0	10.3	13.5
20,000–24,999	2.5	3.2	6.5	12.5	7.3	5.9	9.0
25,000 and over	4.0	4.4	11.6	22.7	11.9	10.7	19.9
No response	3.1	2.4	1.3	2.8	2.2	2.1	3.6

Source: California State Scholarship Commission.

Table 8

STUDENT INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Income class	Junior college	State college	University of California	Private University	Private college	Private college—Denominational	4-year Special
	percent	percent	percent	percent	percent	percent	percent
$0–$1,999	3.4	8.0	11.9	2.3	4.2	9.0	7.3
2,000– 3,999	8.8	14.2	19.0	7.0	12.5	21.2	12.6
4,000– 5,999	17.6	19.6	24.4	9.3	25.0	12.1	18.9
6,000– 7,999	25.1	18.9	17.9	16.3	8.3	12.1	22.1
8,000– 9,999	15.9	12.0	9.5	9.3	25.0	12.1	11.6
10,000–11,999	10.3	11.3	4.8	4.7	4.2	15.2	8.4
12,000–13,999	6.2	6.2	4.8	4.7	0	3.0	4.2
14,000–19,999	4.1	4.0	3.0	18.6	4.2	3.0	5.3
20,000–24,999	2.1	2.9	1.7	0	4.2	0	1.1
25,000 and over	1.7	1.1	.6	14.0	4.2	3.0	3.2
No response	4.7	1.8	2.4	4.7	8.3	9.0	5.3

Source: California State Scholarship Commission.

The affluence of parents of college students is shown by a comparison between the percentages in Table 7 and those in Table 9, which shows the 1962 estimated income distribution of all families with children.

Table 9

CHILDREN AND INCOME 1962

Number of Children under 18

Income	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4* Children
0–$1,000	1.9	1.3	1.4	1.7
$1,000– 1,999	4.0	2.7	2.9	3.3
2,000– 2,999	4.6	3.2	3.3	4.3
3,000– 3,999	6.2	4.7	4.7	6.8
4,000– 4,999	8.2	6.9	7.1	9.3
5,000– 5,999	10.3	9.8	10.3	11.9
6,000– 6,999	11.5	12.6	13.1	13.2
7,000– 7,999	11.1	12.7	13.1	11.8
8,000– 8,999	9.5	11.0	10.9	9.5
9,000– 9,999	7.3	8.4	8.4	7.3
10,000–10,999	6.1	6.5	6.3	5.3
11,000–11,999	4.5	4.7	4.6	3.7
12,000–12,999	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.5
13,000–13,999	2.3	2.4	2.2	1.7
14,000–14,999	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.3
15,000–19,999 20,000–24,999 25,000 and over	7.8	8.4	7.0	6.4

* Four and more children.
Source: Edward Sanders and Hans Palmer, "The Financial Barrier to College Attendance in California," Preliminary Final Draft, California State Scholarship Commission, November 4, 1964.

In comparing Tables 9, 8 and 7, it will be noted that self-supporting students tended to reflect the pattern within the general population more closely than did the parents of non-self-supporting students. This is probably true because self-supporting students generally are drawn out of the general income distribution since so many of the junior college members of this group will be older people with established households.

Probably the most important overall conclusion that can be derived from the straight tabulations of the preceding income distributions is that it costs a great deal more money to attend college than is commonly thought. This is particularly true of certain aspects of the state system. The pattern in the university and the state colleges indicates that families will have to be making a considerably larger sacrifice and have to be at a higher income position than was hitherto thought necessary for their children to attend these institutions. This has been shown to be true at all levels and segments of higher education according to the Sanders and Palmer report, since their survey showed a high correlation between the income level of the parents and the amount of cash support provided the student.

Parental support patterns for the university were similar to those at the private colleges and denominational colleges—cash contributions over $2,000 a year came from a considerable number of those families with incomes over $12,000. At the private universities, the parental contribution of those with incomes over $14,,000 a year was somewhat higher. However, in all segments of higher education, the proportion of families contributing more than $2,000 a year drops off very steeply even among the very high income groups.

In the state colleges, families with incomes of over $14,000 a year also made contributions to their student children of over $2,000 per year. Among the junior colleges, the incidence of high contributions is not as great as it is among private schools, the university or state colleges. However, apparently many junior college families at the upper end of the income spectrum find it necessary to contribute something in excess of $1,000 per year to their student members.

Perhaps the most significant parental support patterns are those of families in the low income brackets. Among the few families found in the $4,000- to $6,000-a-year bracket for the private universities, the majority are contributing more than $1,200 a year to their children's education. This is a striking amount to be extracted from incomes of this level. A great effort by low income families is also found at the state colleges and junior colleges. Some 13.6 percent of state college families and 15.8 percent of junior college families with incomes between $2,000 and $4,000 a year claimed contributions between $400 and $800 per year to their student children.

Thus, despite what may appear to be relatively low fees at public institutions, substantial cash contributions apparently have been required even from low income families of students at those institutions. In addition, by comparing cash contributions to incomes, it seems clear that the parents of junior and state college students are making, on the whole, the greatest effort relative to their income.

For the economic growth of the state to continue, and for the well-being of the society to increase, the committee believes it will be necessary that the economic barriers to these low income families be lifted. No matter what decisions are reached concerning student tuition, any solution must be sought in context of the wide income distributions and consequential financial burdens now existent among California families hopeful of a college education for their children. Steps have been taken to alleviate these burdens by instituting the various loan programs mentioned in the next section of this report. However, findings of the California State Scholarship Commission's report indicate a relatively small proportion of students (less than 10 percent during July 1, 1963, to February 1, 1964) were assisted by these loan programs.

For these reasons, and particularly with reference to the shockingly low percentages of students attending the University of California and the state colleges from low-income backgrounds, we have recommended that the 1967 Legislature give immediate consideration to a proposal which would provide "educational opportunity grants" to children from low-income families in an effort to induce these persons to enter public higher education. Such a proposal, similar to AB 2830 of the 1965 session, would provide grants to such persons irrespective of their college grades, provided they show academic promise. A draft of this legislation is included as Appendix A to this report.

Student Financial Aid

Whenever tuition is discussed, an obvious concern is raised on behalf of the low income family child who has the academic, but not the financial ability to attend college. Most often the counterargument to this real concern is that some financial aid can be made available to this student, thus enabling him or her to attend an educational institution,

regardless of any tuition that institution imposes. Though California's public higher education institutions are formally committed to a tuition-free policy, there are still the financial burdens of college as discussed in the preceding section of this report. To overcome or alleviate these burdens, there are a number of alternative aid programs available at California colleges. None of these programs are exclusive, and many students find it necessary to combine several of them. Most of the means of student financing are not exhaustive, and most students supplement whatever aid they receive by some limited employment.

More students than ever before are members of the labor force part time during the school months and full time in summer. About 75 percent of student enrollment in California institutions holds some sort of job during the year to augment their parents' contribution or student aid for their education. These working student patterns are most predominant among undergraduate students. In the case of graduate students, part time or full-time employment is not the primary source of income, although it does play an important role. The "working student" has been given an additional boost in recent years through the federal "work-study" program. With the president's signature on the Higher Education Act of 1965, institutions of higher education are to receive 90 percent of their costs in providing students part time employment, primarily to those from low income families. California's estimated share for 1965–66 should be about $8 million.

In addition to some type of employment, the student has many loan sources to see him through the non-income-producing college years. Loans to students, influenced in large part by the federal NDEA student loan program, have been increasing in supply at all segments of California higher education. Generally, the availability of loan funds to the student is based on need and, with respect to NDEA loans, on the student's major. In some cases, academic standing is also a consideration for granting especially desirable loans with very lengthy repayment periods. Repayment terms vary among types of loans, as does the total amount available. Cosigners are usually required on all loan notes.

By far the largest type of loan, and generally with the most favorable repayment terms, is the NDEA loan. The NDEA funds provide well over 70 percent of all student loan money available to California students. The 1965 Higher Education Act expanded the major qualification categories, thus enabling more students to have access to these funds. By and large, NDEA funds are still somewhat restricted to those who plan to teach and those studying in physical science fields. Most of the state's colleges have their own student loan programs, many of which are now being oriented toward students not covered by NDEA moneys.

While undoubtedly the NDEA program has been an important stimulus to the development of student loans, certain changes in administration of loans by the individual institutions have contributed. Publicity given to the advisability of a college education, even on borrowed money, and the practice of college financial aid officers of spreading available aid through combinations of scholarships, jobs, and loans have obviously expanded the use of student loans. Also, state actions

through creating higher education assistance corporations and guaranteeing commercial loans have increased the availability of loans.

A new boost was given student loan programs by the federal government's passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Legislature's enactment of AB 56 in 1966. Among other things, this act includes a "low interest insured loan" program authorizing advances totaling $17.5 million through fiscal 1968 to assist in establishing or strengthening the reserve funds of state and private nonprofit student loan insurance programs. Advances will be made to the state program and, for any year the state program is not comprehensive, to private nonprofit programs to the extent necessary to enable students in every eligible institution to be covered by an insured loan program. In addition, a federal insurance program is authorized on a standby basis if adequate state and private plans are not reasonably accessible to students in every eligible institution of higher education. It should be noted that prior to AB 56 California did not maintain a "comprehensive" public loan program.

The new federal-state program provides special assistance for low income families by subsidizing a portion of the interest on their children's loans. For students from families having adjusted family income of less than $15,000 the federal government will subsidize all of the interest while in school and 3 percent thereafter; for students from families having higher incomes there will be no interest subsidy, but the insurance would cover loans to such students. These interest subsidies will be available for federally insured loans and for loans insured under state and private nonprofit programs which meet specified standards, as well as loans made by state programs. For the first two years of the program, the interest subsidy will be available for state and private plans which insure loans charging no higher than 6 percent annual interest on the unpaid balance and requiring repayment to begin no earlier than 60 days after the student ceases his course of study.

In light of such federal intent and action, there may be some question as to the desirability and need for the state to establish or to expand student loan programs within the state.

Large loan programs are advocated by many for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that such loans will remove some of the unfortunate effects of higher tuition on low income families. In addition, loan programs are said to provide help for deserving students not academically high enough to merit scholarships, enable large numbers to enter professions where both training costs and financial rewards are high, and aid students who plan to become teachers.

However, loans may not be a feasible recourse for many students for a variety of considerations. Family cosigners may be unobtainable when required, many times because they are unwilling to have their child or themselves go into debt. Though perhaps "old-fashioned," many families do not believe in obtaining anything by credit, or consider such loans as a mark of inferiority. In other cases the student's family may not actually provide his educational expenses, yet their income is so high as to prevent the student from obtaining a loan.

There are many occupations in which the income the student will earn after graduation is too small to repay a substantial loan incurred

during undergraduate days. A large indebtedness might also prevent a capable college graduate from undertaking graduate work or professional training. In the case of female students, a "negative dowry" is a possible reason for *not* obtaining a loan. From the point of view of the lending institution, loans present many costs and problems of administration, not the least of which is the collectability of principal after the student has left or graduated from college. Thus, while loans have proven a vital device for obtaining education for many, they do not provide a substitute for scholarships.

Both the federal government and the state have scholarship programs, with emphasis in the state's programs on aid for the undergraduate. In the past, the federal government has not been a source of undergraduate scholarships, but passage of the 1965 Higher Education Act made federal scholarships available to those needy high school graduates with high academic standing.

Briefly, the federal scholarship provisions of the Higher Education Act authorizes $70 million for educational opportunity grants during fiscal year 1966 (the first grants would be used during the academic year 1966–67). Institutions of higher education must determine that recipients of the grants show academic promise, are in exceptional financial need, and would not, but for an educational opportunity grant, be financially able to pursue a higher education. These scholarships will range from $200 to $800 with an additional $200 available to students in the upper half of their class during the preceding year. Funds will be allocated among the states on the basis of college enrollment. Institutions could transfer up to 25 percent of their allotted funds to their NDEA loan funds. The act also authorizes the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with state and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations for the purpose of identifying qualified youths of exceptional financial need and encouraging them to continue their education, publicizing existing forms of financial aid, and encouraging secondary school and college dropouts to reenter educational programs.

The entrance of federal money into scholarship funds will greatly help this facet of student aid. Perhaps the biggest problem with scholarships generally has been that scholarship funds have not kept pace with the phenomenal growth in enrollments and the increase of average cost of tuition and fees. The state's Scholarship Commission was able to provide scholarships for 1 percent of the 1963 graduating high school seniors, but only 0.75 percent of the 1964 seniors because of the great increase in high school enrollments.

In addition, a few facts must be understood whenever scholarships are considered as a method of relieving financial barriers to higher education. Approximately two-thirds of the recipients of state scholarships enroll in California independent colleges and universities. Thus, the scholarships provide an opportunity for the intelligent low income student to attend one of the state's private schools and provide income to that school; but, by and large, they do not provide aid of any sort to those who attend a public institution of higher education. Yet, it is generally felt that many students need scholarships in the low tuition public segment of higher education, especially since the recent

rises in student charges in this segment create serious financial hardships for students whose margin of income over expenditures is slight or nonexistent. On the other hand, while low tuition is not a substitute for the scholarship to the low income student, scholarships are not generally thought a feasible alternative to low tuition. Even greatly expanded scholarship programs are not likely to provide aid to much more than 25 percent of the student body. Therefore, the student who is from an average income family and who is average academically probably is better helped through low student charges.

Finally, it should be noted that scholarship funds are generally going to families in income groups substantially above average income families of the United States. Whatever the reason, lower economic classes are not favored in proportion to numbers, abilities or economic status. Perhaps recent added emphasis on need by both state and federal programs will partially reverse the past evidence, but there is no evidence to suggest that scholarships will aid the academically average low income student. Though, historically, scholarships were to aid the very needy, in recent times the scholarship has evolved to aid only the very intelligent—too often this does not include the low income children who perhaps need the formal educational opportunity the most.

Our study has, we believe, fairly conclusively shown that while scholarships to cover such college costs as tuition, fees and books have been made available by state and federal governments in increasingly large amounts, the California Legislature has as yet refused to implement one suggestion relative to student aid initially made by the master plan survey team in 1960. This proposal was that the state provide subsistence grants to certain financially needy scholarship winners. Such a program, for the first year, could be financed with an appropriation of approximately $250,000.

We are acutely aware of the often-quoted, tongue-in-cheek comment of the California student that it is more costly for him to attend the University of California than Harvard University. Strangely enough, there is enough truth in this to cause us concern. The comment is based, of course, upon the fact that the eastern private institution offers complete subsistence and tuition scholarships to the truly needy and qualified student, while the California institutions do not. We believe that our recommendation contains added weight in view of the rapidly climbing institutional and noninstitutional costs of public college attendance in this state. This proposal should, we believe, take precedence over any proposal at the 1967 session to increase scholarship funds *per se*. Any such proposal, while desirable, is likely to benefit more those who have reasonable financial ability while ignoring the low income students, who are grossly underrepresented in our colleges and universities at the present time.

The Effects of Tuition in California

Economists generally agree that initial $100 increments in tuition would have little impact on enrollment in colleges. The demand for higher education is said to be "inelastic" since a rise in "price" does not generally equivalently reduce the enrollment. Continued increases in personal income and student aid would further dilute the impact. Some support for this "inelasticity" of higher education is found by the figures in Table 1, which shows increasing percentages in nonresi-

dent enrollment even though the university increased its nonresident tuition. In addition, national surveys indicate the consumer places a great value on education and is consequently willing to absorb increased costs of such education. However, past growth of public institutions relative to private institutions does indicate that *substantial* differences in fees *do* become a crucial factor. Also, the tables in Appendix B clearly indicate that the percentage of California families financially unable to meet the expenses of higher education will increase as tuition is increased. It would seem the inelasticity concept of education enrollments is limited, at least with respect to the low income family's child unable to obtain some form of student aid.

Even though total enrollments may not substantially be affected by invoking tuition, there is likely to be a change in the social composition of the student body. Assuming no enlarged scholarship fund, there will undoubtedly be a "leakage" away from higher education of superior students from the low financial stratum. Higher student charges may well deter those with reasonable finances who are somewhat deficient in motivation. Further, there may well be a shift by students from curricula leading to modest future incomes to studies having a much higher future earnings potential. Of course, any of these potential socioeconomic shifts may be reversed or diluted by any number of counteracting financial aid programs.

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education has estimated the probable tuition fee income calculated for an initial $100 increment in student charges. The estimates are here presented in Table 10.

It can be safely assumed if no tuition or a much lower tuition were imposed upon the junior colleges, a much lower tuition income would be derived overall. This is true because lower junior college costs would multiply the current migration of students to junior colleges for their first two years.

Table 10

1964 ENROLLMENT ADJUSTED FOR $100 TUITION

	University	State colleges	Junior colleges
Full-time enrollment	71,500	92,600	155,300
Less: nonresident enrollment	13,000	5,500	(unknown)
Resident enrollment	58,500	87,100	155,300
Less: 2 percent "leakage"	1,170	1,750	3,100
Adjusted full-time enrollment	57,330	85,360	152,200
× $100 tuition fee	$5.7 million	$8.5 million	$15.2 million
Part-time enrollment	5,300	56,200	285,600
Less: 2 percent "leakage"	100	1,120	5,700
Adjusted part-time enrollment	5,200	55,080	279,900
× $50 tuition fee	$0.3 million	$2.8 million	$14.0 million
Total revenue	$6.0 million	$11.3 million	$29.2 million

Source: Coordinating Council on Higher Education, "An Evaluation of the Tuition Free Principle in California Public Higher Education," May 1965, p. 31.

It can also be stated that additional tuition charges would increase total tuition revenues at a diminishing rate. As the tuition charge increases it is generally agreed that the "leakage" of students from higher education would increase at an accelerated rate.

The imposition of a tuition charge at public higher education institutions would indoubtedly have some impact on enrollments at the private colleges and universities. What amount of impact is very speculative in light of the relatively high median income of Californians, but it can be safely said that some increase in private school enrollments will occur as public school tuition is raised substantially.

It appears clear to the committee from these figures that the imposition of a tuition in moderate amounts cannot reasonably be considered as much of a revenue raiser. These figures show that each $100 of tuition charged would produce no more than $30 million of revenue; thus a $500 tuition (the highest "moderate" tuition we have seen proposed) would produce only $150 million for the State General Fund. Considering the substantial amounts that such a tuition would require be poured back into state expenditures for support of increased student aid programs, it is obvious that no reasonable man will balance the state budget from such a source.

This does not, however, rule tuition out as desirable social or educational policy. With the student population at our state colleges and universities so heavily tipped in favor of students from families with money, we believe that tuition might well be looked upon as an equalizer of educational opportunity. We seriously question, for example, the continuance of a state policy which subsidizes the education of children from well-to-do families when poor students are denied admittance to higher education on financial grounds. A tuition *might* (and we emphasize this term, since we have not made a final determination on the issue) provide for much more equal entry into the system, if it was combined with substantial waivers and scholarship and subsistence funds.

Finally, we must devote some attention to the proposal which has been made in previous sessions of the Legislature for the imposition of a "deferred tuition-student loan plan." Such a program, as embodied in AB 600 of the 1965 session, would clearly raise large amounts of funds by the imposition of what amounts to a *user tax* imposed upon the consumers of higher education in California. Clearly too, such a plan *is* tuition and a loan program, rolled into a package.

Such a program has serious flaws, we believe, in terms of its effect upon California society in general and public higher education in particular. While attractive on its face, the plan would convert, in fact if not in intent, our public colleges and universities into producers of job skills, rather than disseminators of knowledge. Because the measure calls for a student payback of his tuition which will vary depending upon the cost of his particular education, and the income which he derives from his employment when he graduates, it could well discourage students from entering college to pursue areas of knowledge which they want to pursue, in favor of their enrollment in a program depending upon its effect on their eventual payback to the state.

For example, because a medical degree is costly to obtain, and its recipient is likely to enter a high-paying profession which would require from him a maximum payback to the state, might he not instead enroll

in a curriculum leading to employment in a low-paying profession—such as social work—so as to avoid a high payback? What about the effect of such a plan on the marriage plans of college graduates—would a male college graduate be as likely to marry a female college graduate with a $10,000 debt to the state? Such a plan could, in this sense, constitute a negative dowry.

In short, while the advocates of such a plan are well intentioned, we believe they have not thoroughly investigated the long-range, non-revenue-producing aspects of their plan. We consequently recommend that such a proposal be shelved and that instead, study be devoted to a consideration of the equalizing effects of a moderate tuition charge.

STATE LEVEL GOVERNANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

FINDINGS

1. The committee finds that the present administrative structure for California's 75 junior colleges within the Department of Education is weak and unable to provide the leadership needed if this vital segment of the state's higher education system is to assume the role designated by the Master Plan for Higher Education.

2. It is evident to us that in an attempt to cope with the mounting state level problems of the public junior colleges, the Department of Education has done administratively what the Legislature has refused to appropriate funds to allow the department to do; that is, three separate bureaus have been established to deal with junior college affairs. However, it is apparent that these bureaus cannot begin to solve the many problems of junior college governance which have emerged since their creation.

3. We find that the State Board of Education, charged by our statutes with the duty of setting state level policy for the junior colleges, has neither the time nor apparently the inclination to do the job. As a last-ditch attempt to keep from losing governance over the junior colleges, the state board has established a junior college advisory committee. This effort is, in our opinion, woefully inadequate in the face of the leadership needs of the junior colleges.

4. We find that in 1960 the Legislature declared the junior colleges to be an integral part, not of the public school system, but of higher education. Yet in nearly every respect California state government still treats the two-year institutions as if they were bona fide elements of "lower" education. We believe that leadership to make the changes necessary to convert the junior colleges to the higher education role—in finance, administration, personnel and curriculum matters—will not be forthcoming until the colleges have an effective voice in Sacramento to speak for them. This means that the colleges themselves will have to make the basic decision as to whether they *want* to be a part of higher education, a decision which they have not yet made collectively. A decision in favor of participation as coequals in California's higher education structure will demand divorcing the junior colleges from the locus of state-level administration for the public schools, namely the state board and Department of Education.

5. The committee finds that a separate board of governors at the state level for the junior colleges need not result in a substantive loss of local autonomy by the two-year institutions. Parenthetically, however, we have observed that some junior college officials have grown to enjoy the relative isolation from the State Board of Education which their institutions experience, an isolation which exists not because the law does not require state level supervision in various areas, but rather because the State Board of Education does not have sufficient time to do the job for the junior colleges required of it by the law.

6. We find that a separate state board for the junior colleges can be created which will perform the duties presently mandated upon the State Board of Education with respect to junior colleges without auto-

matically assuming more control over the local institutions, but providing at the same time needed leadership and a united voice for the colleges in the councils of higher education in California.

7. The committee has noted that in recent months nearly all statewide junior college organizations in California, together with the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, have voted overwhelmingly in favor of the creation of a separate junior college board at the state level. A study by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California, Berkeley, commissioned by the Coordinating Council, has proposed the creation of such a board. The study includes the impressive results of a poll taken of junior college presidents and administrators, showing that a large proportion of them now favor a statewide junior college board. At its hearing on this issue in 1965 the large majority of the committee's witnesses also approved this concept. Thus, the committee believes that the climate for such a proposal is favorable and there is substantial likelihood that the 1967 Legislature will favorably consider a well-drafted bill to accomplish this result.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee Recommends That:

The 1967 Legislature favorably consider a bill to establish a separate Board of Governors for the California Junior Colleges, with such a body to assume the duties and responsibilities of junior college policy setting and administration presently vested in the State Board of Education, such duties and responsibilities to include the following:

A. Centralized research and statewide planning recommendations.
B. Statewide coordination and development of a junior college system encompassing the entire State of California.
C. District organization.
D. State finance of junior college operational and capital costs.
E. Data collection.
F. Coordination of federal funds for junior colleges, together with primary responsibility for the development of statewide plans for the use of federal funds, when required.
G. Representation for the junior colleges on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, before the Legislature and the executive branch.
H. Certification of junior college instructional personnel, so long as certification requirements are retained for junior college employees and faculty.

It is our view that local autonomy, exercised by locally elected junior college boards of trustees, should continue to be operative within this framework, provided that the new state body shall possess leadership capability in speaking for the junior colleges on policy matters.

The board of governors should be given a budget adequate to enable it to hire a Chancellor for the Junior Colleges at a rank and salary equivalent to that of the Director of the Coordinating Council, together with such staff personnel as the chancellor deems necessary. The chancellor should be appointed for a four-year term to serve at the pleasure of the board of governors, and should have the power of non-civil-service appointments of at least his top three staff assistants. The remainder of the chancellor's staff should be appointed from civil service lists.

The committee further recommends that the board of governors be composed of 10 members, selected by the Governor for 10-year staggered terms (one selection each year) and confirmed by a two-thirds vote of the State Senate. Such a board should become operative on June 30, 1968, to provide for an orderly and planned transition of powers. We recommend that the board be selected from among outstanding lay citizens of California who have a strong interest in the further development and improvement of the public junior colleges, and at least five of whom shall be required to have served in the past as members of local junior college governing boards in this state.[1] The board should serve without salary but should receive necessary travel and expense reimbursements.

[1] Assemblyman Flournoy believes this requirement for five members of the new board to be former junior college board members to be "overly restrictive."

Finally, we recommend that the legislation which we propose provide that junior college representation on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education consist of three persons, as follows:

a. One member of the board of governors, chosen annually by the board.

b. The Chancellor of the California Junior Colleges.

c. One California junior college president, chosen annually by a statewide junior college organization.

STATE LEVEL GOVERNANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

One of the recurring problems in higher education, which has confronted the Legislature for the last several years, has been that of providing effective, coequal, state level leadership for the state's 75 junior colleges. The Master Plan for Higher Education, as embodied in the Donahoe Act of 1960, contained important new functions and responsibilities for these two-year institutions, and formally enumerated these schools among the state's higher education system. However, with this change in role, no similarly far-reaching changes were made by the Legislature in the methods of administering and providing leadership to these colleges. Consequently, California today is faced with an anomalous situation of having a major segment (and some might say *the* major segment) of its higher education system administered as the grade schools are administered, and by the same people.

In an effort to develop constructive solutions to what might be termed a "leadership gap," this subcommittee has listened to many experts in the field of the junior colleges, both at its public hearings in January 1966 and in private discussions. Close attention has been paid by the subcommittee to the study, recently released by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California, Berkeley, of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a separate state board for the junior colleges. We have been especially interested in watching the reaction of junior college board members, presidents and administrators to this report, and to the issue generally. We are pleased to report that all of these groups now seem to be in favor of taking the major step in the direction of leadership which this subcommittee has independently determined is now required: the creation of a state level board to administer junior college affairs.

The Present Junior College Administrative Structure

The subcommittee has expended some effort in determining the effectiveness of the present state level system of junior college governance in its desire to determine whether a state level board for junior college was really desirable. We have been appalled at what we have found. Under present law, the State Board and Department of Education are responsible for junior college governance; however, there is little to indicate that the massive problems of the state's junior colleges take up more than a fraction of the board's time at its monthly meetings. In his opening statement at our hearing on this subject the chairman pointed out:

> Several months ago the committee consultant remarked to me—I hope he was kidding but I'm not sure—that he placed a recent agenda for the State Board of Education, which presently supposedly provides state level guidance to the junior colleges, upon an ordinary weighing scale. He found that this agenda weighed some 11 pounds! Sad to say, however, only six pages of this immense document—dealing with the agenda of the State Board of Education—only six pages dealt with the junior colleges.

The example is illustrative of the lack of attention which junior college problems receive under the current structure. In a recent attempt to give the appearance of providing more leadership for these two-year institutions, the state board established a junior college advisory panel. However, all the evidence we have seen indicates that this is simply too little, too late.

Much of the leadership needs of the junior colleges arise from their new responsibilites for undergraduate academic education, required under the master plan. As can be seen in the table below, the full-time enrollment in California junior colleges has increased drastically since the base year of 1945, and even since the adoption of the master plan in 1960 junior college enrollments have risen by more than 53,000 full-time students. Comparing these junior college increases with those experienced by the other segments of higher education, it becomes clear that the junior colleges have seen the most severe enrollment increase. Clearly, such important institutions cannot be allowed to fall into a leadership vacuum and still be expected to fulfill these vital responsibilities.

Previous Legislatures have grappled with the problem of providing effective state level junior college leadership. Due to a continuing controversy over the creation of a state board for this purpose, the 1965 Legislature failed to approve funds requested by the Department of Education to create a new "Division of Junior Colleges" within that agency. However, we note that upon failure of this legislation the department proceeded to set up—on an administrative basis—three separate junior college bureaus, staffed by taking personnel from departmental bureaus which deal primarily with the grade schools.

The subcommittee has seen no evidence that this move was successful in providing important new services or guidance to the junior col-

FULL-TIME ENROLLMENTS IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION *

Year	Junior colleges	State colleges	University of California	Private	Total
1945	17,406	6,851	18,400	19,661	62,318
1950	56,622	25,369	39,492	41,036	162,521
1955	70,165	33,910	37,035	40,003	181,113
1960	99,783	56,480	46,801	53,785	257,725
1961	112,636	64,099	51,340	57,220	286,223
1962	121,283	71,502	55,775	61,234	310,888
1963	128,221	80,188	61,073	61,618	332,339
1964	152,401	92,454	67,070	64,000	375,425
PROJECTIONS					
1970	216,200	134,475	105,150	81,800	537,625
1975	267,100	166,325	125,300	91,100	649,825

* The data prior to 1960 are from *A Study of the Needs for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California;* those from 1960–1964 are from reports of total and full-time enrollments as prepared by the Department of Finance. Projections are from CCHE, *California's Needs for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education*, No. 1014 (Sacramento, December 1964), p. 17.

leges. We suspect that it may have been motivated largely by a desire to make some show of activity toward providing for junior college needs, whether or not they were actually provided for. In any event, the three new bureaus have served the colleges no better than the previous single bureau served. Stark testimony to this fact was apparent when one witness, one of the few to oppose the creation of a state level junior college board, appeared before this body and began to cite per student cost figures for the state's junior colleges. When he was asked whether he obtained his figures from the Department of Education he replied that the department had not had the figures available, and that it was necessary for him to go to the Coordinating Council for the information.

Considering the vital importance of the junior colleges to California's higher education scheme, it was instructive to the subcommittee to consider the numbers of individuals employed by the Department of Education to provide leadership to this segment of higher education which presently educates more undergraduates than the University of California and the state colleges combined. This subcommittee is acutely aware that numbers of state employees is not a complete measure of the magnitude of the job done by a state agency, but we cite the information in the list below because we believe it is useful to illustrate our point:

PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION IN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Bureau of Junior College General Education

Dr. John N. Given, Acting Chief
Dr. Carl G. Winter
Mr. Kenneth A. Wood

Bureau of Junior College Administration and Finance

Dr. Gerald D. Cresci, Acting Chief
Dr. Edward H. Lehman
Mr. James J. Gorman
Miss Doris A. Welch

Bureau of Junior College Vocational Technical Education

Mr. Leland P. Baldwin, Acting Chief
Mr. Robert A. Harvey
Mrs. Celeste Mercer
Mrs. Velma Johnston
Mr. John P. Piper
Mr. J. Winston Silva

Thus, it appears that 13 persons out of a state agency employing more than 2,000 state workers are involved in junior college leadership and guidance. We can hardly agree that such an organizational structure constitutes a bold, new approach to junior college problems by an agency of state government.

Support for the Creation of a Junior College Board

In our study of this issue numerous and varied organizations, and experts have indicated to the subcommittee their support for the crea-

tion of a junior college board within state government. The office of the Legislative Analyst strongly supported such a development when its representative said:

> "For the most part the state has played a passive role in the development of the junior colleges, leaving the initiative to local districts. This is particularly true of the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education. In recent years the board has been able to give very little attention to junior college matters because of the press of its responsibilities with respect to elementary and secondary levels. Lacking direction from the board, the department has been unable on its own to provide real leadership . . .
>
> "Thus there is no effective official body at the state level which has a daily working relationship with the junior colleges and which can effectively guide the development of strong instructional standards, coordinated educational planning and efficient and effective conduct of the junior college programs with the state and local tax funds which it makes available. And there is no official body to effectively represent the junior college before the Legislature and in their relations with other state agencies."

Having thus outlined clearly the weaknesses of the present system, the analyst proceeded to outline the three major proposals which have been advanced to assist the junior colleges: (1) the creation of a new "Division of Junior Colleges" within the Department of Education; (2) such a new division, coupled with a special advisory committee on junior college affairs, composed of members of various junior college organizations; and (3) the creation of a state level junior college board. The analyst commented:

> "In our opinion, the first two (suggestions) are intended largely to preserve the status quo, for as long as the present State Board of Education remains as the governing body . . . there will be no real opportunity for leadership at the state level . . .
>
> "In our opinion the opponents of proposals to create a separate board fail to see that the junior colleges have become more than just local institutions intended to serve only the immediate community in which they are located.
>
> "The inability of the State Board of Education to deal as effectively with junior college matters as with elementary and secondary school affairs has been evident for some time. *If there is to be greater state leadership on a continuing basis, then a change is inevitable.* (Emphasis ours) . . .
>
> "We therefore recommend the establishment of a state board for junior colleges . . ."

Support for this proposal was also received from one of the major faculty organizations representing the junior colleges. The representative of this organization supported the creation of a state board on the basis of the inability of the State Board of Education to devote much time to junior college affairs. This witness pointed out that:

> ". . . the State Department of Education has only a small staff devoting itself to junior college education. It appears that only routine junior college business consumes all of the available time

> of this inadequate staff which has resulted in no time for creative thinking and planning to enable junior colleges throughout the state to do better what they are doing well today."

The witness also noted the situation which members of this subcommittee have often—too often—been confronted with when junior college legislation is pending. The lack of a clear, unified voice representing these institutions has, in our view, been a major roadblock to the enactment of much needed junior college legislation. The conflicting claims and counterclaims, the disputed figures and effects of certain bills, emanating from many of the individual 75 junior colleges, combine to lead many legislators to seriously doubt whether *any* legislation affecting junior colleges should be approved. Obviously, a state level junior college board, speaking with one voice for, and representative of, these varied institutions could make a clearer and more effective impact on and presentation before the Legislature.

Finally, the study done for the Coordinating Council by Dr. Leland L. Medsker and Dr. George W. Clark of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, which was completed after this subcommittee's public hearings on this subject, bear close scrutiny. The study, which was received by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in the fall of 1966, concluded:

> "In the final analysis, then there appear to be indications that a separate board would be advisable from the standpoint of what it could do for junior colleges. Perhaps its most important mission would be to take the lead in planning for these institutions in a state where the magnitude of operations is as great as it is in California."

More important to this subcommittee than the conclusions reached in this study, however, are the figures obtained by the researchers who polled various segments of California which are concerned with the junior colleges, in an effort to determine the acceptability of a state junior college board. Generally, these show a wide acceptance from all groups for the idea of such a board, provided that it retains no more powers than those which presently reside in the State Board of Education.

We have reproduced in Appendix C to this report several of the tables from the Medsker report in which the responses of the junior college community were tabulated. Suffice it to say at this point that:

—Nearly half (45.9 percent) of the 1,285 junior college staff members in California believe that a separate state board for junior colleges should be established. Only 10 percent indicated that the status quo should remain.

—51 of the 70 junior college chief administrative officers in the state favored a separate junior college board.

—17 percent of the junior college governing board members, in 1965 prior to the reorganization of the Department of Education into three junior college bureaus, believed that a separate board at the state level should be established, and an additional 22 percent favored such a board if it were merely advisory to the State Board of Education. Since that time the junior college section of the California School Boards Association has formally proposed the creation of a separate board.

—Most importantly, the large majority of legislators of both political parties interviewed by the researchers favored a state junior college board.

In reaction to the Medsker report, the Coordinating Council, which commissioned it in September 1966, adopted a resolution endorsing the concept of a separate board for junior colleges, although not suggesting a specific makeup for the body.

On the basis of these expressions of support for this important new proposal, and the support shown for it by the research cited, this subcommittee has concluded that it is feasible and desirable for a state board for junior colleges to be established by legislation in 1967, and we strongly urge the Legislature to take such action.

The Subcommittee Proposal

Our proposal may be simply summarized as representing what we feel to be the best aspects of the legislation proposed in the Medsker study, together with suggestions offered by the California School Boards Association and other individuals and organizations. Initially, we believe that the authorizing statute should attempt to spell out, generally, the duties of a state board for junior colleges. This cannot be accomplished in detail until a comprehensive legal description of the present duties and responsibilities of the State Board of Education which pertain to junior colleges is obtained. The subcommittee, in response to a request from the Coordinating Council, has requested such a legal digest from the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

A. Centralized statewide research concerning junior college problems and programs.
B. Responsibility for statewide junior college planning, including formation and enlargement of junior college districts and organization.
C. Responsibility for anlayzing the effectiveness of state operational and capital financing of local junior college operations, and for recommending changes therein.
D. Collection of statistical data relating to junior colleges.
E. Planning for, and use of, federal funds for junior colleges, with particular emphasis toward the application of such funds in coordination with state and local moneys, so that funds are selectively applied to the areas of greatest need.
F. Certification of junior colleges and junior college instructional personnel.
G. Representation of junior colleges and junior college interests on the Coordinating Council, before the Governor and before the Legislature.

Such a generalized listing of major responsibilities, together with language granting to such a board all those duties pertaining to junior colleges presently exercised by the State Board of Education, should provide for a strong state agency but still protect the proper interests of local junior college boards to develop their schools in a way which will meet the needs of the particular communities which they serve. In this sense, there is no legitimate issue of "local control" involved in our recommendation. We merely recommend the transfer and centraliza-

tion of existing duties to another, stronger and better staffed state agency, more in sympathy with junior college needs.

We suggest that such a board be entitled "The Board of Governors for the California Junior Colleges," thus rejecting the suggestion that we substitute the term "community" for "junior." We have concluded that these institutions are clearly still colleges which are in a real sense "junior" to the University of California and the state colleges, in that they offer a two-year program in contrast to a four-year, degree-granting program. At the same time, the junior colleges can no longer be looked upon as merely "community" colleges, since many of them are now regional and serve much larger areas. Truly, the junior colleges are of statewide—not communitywide—concern, and fulfill a vital state role. They should remain "junior" colleges.

With regard to the composition of such a board, we propose the creation of a 10-member body, with all members to be appointed by the Governor for 10-year terms and confirmed by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Under this plan, one board term would expire every year. With the long, staggered terms which we propose, it would be virtually impossible for any one Governor to appoint all the members of the board.

We recommend that such a board become operative no later than June 30, 1968, in order to provide for an orderly transition of powers and duties from the State Board of Education, but we suggest that the members might well be selected in advance of this date so that they may become acquainted with their duties. Board of Governors members should serve without pay, but the legislation should provide that they receive necessary and actual per diem and travel allowances, in a manner similar to the present State Board of Education. In order to insure that persons knowledgeable in junior college affairs will be well represented on the new board, our recommendation includes a provision that at least one-half (5) of the board members be required to have served in the past on local junior college governing boards in California, although none of them should be members at the time they assume a seat on the new state board. Such a proposal is consistent with a similar proposal which the full Assembly Committee on Education has made with respect to the composition of the State Board of Education, and should further insure that the board of governors will not encroach upon local autonomy of junior college district boards.

Our recommendations include provisions relative to the powers of the board of governors to appoint an administrative officer—a Chancellor for the Junior Colleges—to serve at the pleasure of the board for a four-year term. The chancellor should have the authority to hire—exempt from civil service requirements—his top three assistants, while the remainder of the board's staff should be composed of civil service appointments. To make sure that an individual of the highest quality is selected by the board of governors as chancellor, it is essential that the pay of that official be set so as to attract the best of the few junior college experts that can be found in the nation. Hence, the salary of this official should be at least equivalent to that of the Director of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, which would still place his compensation considerably below the salaries of the administrative officers of the junior college's two copartners in higher education: the university and the state colleges.

Lastly, our legislation calls for the junior colleges to be represented on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education by three persons, as follows:

A. One member of the board of governors, chosen annually by that board.
B. The chancellor.
C. One California junior college president, chosen annually by a statewide association of junior college officials and board members and ratified by the board governors.

Such representation should give strong voice to the new board and its chief officer, while preserving the seat presently held on the Coordinating Council by the chief state junior college association. In addition, the voice of the junior colleges will be more uniformly heard in the state since the same spokesmen for these institutions on their state board will also serve on the Coordinating Council.

In our view, the case has been clearly made for the establishment of a State Board for Junior Colleges, which will fulfill the goal of elevation of these vital schools as coequals in the partnership of higher education with the state-operated institutions which was foreseen in the master plan. Enactment of a proposal such as we suggest, the broad concepts of which have already been almost universally accepted by the junior college community, can become one of the leading achievements of the 1967 Legislature.

THE FUNCTIONS OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION

FINDINGS

The Committee Finds That:

1. Increasing proportions of professional time are devoted to research as contrasted with classroom instruction in institutions of higher education.
2. The academic marketplace in California and the nation makes research activities more lucrative than teaching.
3. Professors in the sciences and social sciences are able to obtain additional income for summer projects in research.
4. Most faculty members wish to devote even more time to research and less time to teaching and administration than is presently the case.
5. There is little if any distinction made between first rate research and second rate research.
6. The term "research" varies greatly in meaning and interpretation. "Instructional research," largely connected with scientific laboratory work, seems to be an important teaching aid when it involves students directly. This is in sharp contrast to research in professional academic achievement which does not involve the student, but which often results in impractical, pedantic treatises, which, though published, usually perish.
7. There is little if any distinction made between first and second rate teaching.
8. Undergraduate class sizes in our colleges and universities have increased in order to maintain or lower faculty teaching loads within restricted budgets.
9. Personal contact between undergraduate and teacher has seriously deteriorated.
10. Prestige in teaching is frequently measured by the grade level of the courses taught.
11. The proportion of the age group enrolled in graduate instruction is approximately equal to the proportion of the age group enrolled as undergraduates a generation ago.
12. The growth in undergraduate enrollment has been considerably greater than the growth in resources allocated to this function.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee Recommends That:

1. The Legislature should enact a concurrent resolution asking the regents and the trustees to create financial incentives to reward superior teaching. Such incentives should be awarded on a permanent (although revocable) basis, and they should not be less than $1,000 per year apiece.

2. The regents, by concurrent resolution should be requested, and the trustees by statute should be directed, to require a full 12-hour teaching load for one year in every seven for any professor.[1]

3. The university and the state colleges should be asked to create permanent committees for the assessment of research in terms of quality and utility. Such committees should be directed to report to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education at appropriate intervals.

4. The university should adopt rules for granting a doctor of arts degree (all Ph.D. requirements except the dissertation) and establish employment rules guaranteeing equal status of the D.A. with the Ph.D.[2]

5. Employment and retention policies should be changed to permit the permanent employment of above superior teachers, regardless of their publications or degrees.

6. The Coordinating Council should be directed to develop a cooperative program for the exchange of teachers on an annual or biennial basis among the state colleges, the junior colleges, and the university campuses. Such exchanges should not necessarily be limited to public institutions, and for this purpose all credential laws for junior colleges should be waived.

7. For outstanding teachers in the state there should be established, by statute and special appropriation, a number of special and permanent stipends. These awards should be known as "Governor's Professorships" and should move with the individual so long as he remains a teacher in the state. The awards should be made on institutional recommendation of the regents, trustees and junior college boards.

---

[1] Assemblyman Flournoy states: "I believe a 12-hour teaching load is excessive, and greater than normal practice at major universities."

[2] Relative to this recommendation, Assemblyman Flournoy dissents and comments: "I strongly disagree. In many institutions the dissertation is the only distinction between the M.A. and the Ph.D. I see no reason why the proposed D.A. and the Ph.D. should be accorded equal status, since one would require, in my judgment, *at least* one year less graduate effort than the other."

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

THE FUNCTIONS OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION

THE QUALITY OF TEACHING IS STRAINED

On August 18 of 1966, the Assembly Education Subcommittee on Higher Education met in San Francisco to consider the issue of instructional quality in our public institutions of higher education. More precisely, the issue involved the increasing tendency of research activities to detract from the traditional emphasis on classroom instruction at the state colleges and university campuses.

The committee has concluded that the problems resulting from a basic change in American values (toward higher education) are not subject to simplified explanation or cure. Specifically, we would reject an oversimplification—reminiscent of certain conspiracy theories—that the reduction of attention paid to undergraduates is some kind of malevolent plot by authorities. We would agree that within limits, college and university authorities have attempted to provide programs aimed at improving the classroom instructional program.

In the past generation or so, it has become the fashion that a high school graduate will attend college. That many will never be graduated is attested to by recent statistics showing only about a quarter of the age group achieving this goal. Even this figure, however, is far, far greater than that which was obtained during the last relatively peaceful period in our history, the middle twenties.

The issue of teaching and research is further complicated by the fact that unlike elementary and secondary education, those involved in higher education—both students and faculty—operate in an environment which has little relation to the niceties of state boundary lines. Our institutions of higher learning operate in a truly national environment which California, itself, can influence to some extent, but not control.

In somewhat the same manner as corporate and government officers move from state to state as an integral part of a career, the university professor is likewise career-oriented. The interstate character of faculty positions is in no way different than these other leading sectors of the economy, and no reminiscence of bygone eras will resurrect the institution-oriented professor of the past.

Above and beyond personnel matters, there is a complex of fundamental political questions which affect the quality of instruction in higher education. On the one hand, there is constant demand for significant expansion of educational opportunity in higher education. But at the same time, there is an equal demand for limiting governmental expenditures.

These two widely pervasive forces are totally antithetical, yet both major political parties have reflected these "grass roots" desires to one extent or another.

We note with considerable trepidation the emergence of post doctoral study as an incipient institution by itself. And we would question whether the necessity for additional study is imperative, or whether this novelty is, in fact, a necessary method for drawing distinctions

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

among the holders of doctorates. Indeed, whether postdoctoral study is not a supergraduate school necessitated by the decline and fall of the master's degree and perhaps a slow erosion of the doctorate should be closely examined by higher educators and legislators.

In testimony given at our hearing, it was repeatedly said by officials of the University of California that research activity is part and parcel of the teaching process. We note, however, that almost all witnesses we heard were representatives of the natural sciences or mathematics, and that the committee was not presented with the views of humanists or social scientists.

As a direct parallel, we note that most research funds are devoted to the natural sciences, with some being reserved for social science. Virtually nothing is available for research in the humanities.

It is true that substantial amounts of money are necessary to purchase the equipment needed in scientific research, but it does not follow extra stipends are equally necessary.

It is documented in the 1962 research of Harold Orlans [1] that paid summer positions are widely available to natural and social scientists for research activities, and it is likewise stated that virtually nothing is available to the humanities. The committee would point out that the effect of this system is to drive teachers into their own research, simply in order to qualify for future summer grants. Thus, while the summer project does not directly detract from teaching, it surely does so indirectly.

John Fischer, writing in *Harper's* (February 1965), put it this way:

> ". . . our whole system is now rigged against good teaching. No faculty member (with rare exceptions) is rewarded if he teaches well, or punished if he doesn't. On the contrary, all the incentives are arranged to divert him away from teaching, no matter how strong a vocation he may have for it, and to penalize him if he wastes too much time on mere students."

Still, we in California cannot reverse a national practice, even if we wanted to. Our career-minded professors would simply leave the state.

Conversely, there are no substantial programs for rewarding work in the classroom. Occasionally, we hear of citations for teaching excellence, but few of these carry continuing monetary rewards. The quality of teaching is called an immeasurable intangible, and the problem is dismissed as insoluble.

In this context, the committee would point out that little evaluation of research is attempted either. The staff has made available to the committee a study by the Oregon School Study Council in 1960.[2] Although the particular subject is an analysis of past research on class size, this is not material to the present subject. What is material, and somewhat amazing is that the Oregon study found nearly three-fourths of the past research in this area to be scientifically invalid—which is to say that the expenditure of time and money in this area has resulted in little more than an addition to bibliographies. Hence, we would question whether research activity should be taken at face value for promotion purposes when no system for evaluating the research exists. It

[1] Orlans, Harold, The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1962, 361 pages.

would seem to us, as laymen, that one "Origin of Species," or "Principia Mathematica" is worth 10,000 articles of lesser light in scholarly journals.

However, the committee believes that there are sound substantial reasons why faculty members express their preference for more research time. We believe it is a primary method by which some faculty members can avoid the paradox of public demands for more educational opportunity without equivalent expansion of educational expenditures.

Since the middle 1920's the enrollment in California public institutions of higher learning has grown very rapidly. Whereas, the University of California enrolled approximatly 15,000 students 40 years ago, the University has now approached the 90,000 mark. This is twice the rate of growth in the general population at least. The state college system has similarly grown from a group of teachers' colleges enrolling 5,000 to 8,000 into a total system of over 170,000 students. At the junior college level, the fantastic growth from 8,000 to 320,000 has been possible only because of lower per-student costs, both in operating costs and in out-of-pocket costs to the students personally.

Part of the increased cost of education has been met by higher state and local expenditures of tax revenues. Nevertheless, a substantial part of the added costs has been subsidized by relatively lower rewards for teachers in the colleges and universities. On a national scale, total expenditures (including research) increased from about one-half of 1 percent of national income in 1929–30 to 1½ percent in 1963–64. This is a fair measure since it takes account of depreciated dollar values over the span of time.

It is easily seen that a mere tripling of expenditures cannot maintain the past standards of faculty remuneration, and in this situation, it seems reasonable to conclude that individual faculty members have turned to publication and research stipends in order to regain their former relative standard of living.

To quote from Harold Orlans:

> "It is our thesis that federal research programs, acting in concert with other educational forces, have reduced the time that senior university faculty devote to undergraduates and informal faculty contacts with students, and, in general, have attenuated the personal aspects of undergraduate education at the great universities."

In a more polemical article, a past leader of the Free Speech Movement has written in *Harper's* [3] that:

> "Given these economic facts of life, each faculty member must choose to be primarily a teacher or primarily a researcher; there is not enough time to do both jobs adequately."

One can judge the trends in financing higher education by reference to increases for general and organized research functions. The 1966 Statistical Abstract shows an increase in the gross national product from 1930 to 1966 of some $469 billion, approximately sixfold at constant prices.

Higher education expenditures increased thirteenfold, but within this broad category, organized research increased 78 times while other

[3] October 1966.

expenditures increased only elevenfold. The bulk of the growth in organized research is due to federal subvention, although there is increasing pressure for additional support from the state budget.

The distinction between research and teaching, however, is only one method of creating prestige within a system. Orlans reports that the grade level of teaching is equally valued by those within the profession. In ascending order, the upper division teacher outranks lower division. Graduate professors have status over undergraduate professors, and we suppose that the prospect of having professors for postdoctoral students will add to the ladder.

This is unfortunately the same attitude that high school teachers take, vis-à-vis elementary teachers. As a counter, the Legislature in recent years has passed several laws which, incidentally, create additional status for the elementary teachers. That is, the Legislature, through measures designed to reduce class size in the primary grades and provide specialist reading teachers in these grades, has, in effect, ignored opposite trends within the school system and provided both additional prestige and support for the elementary teacher.

However, the governance of the state colleges and university campuses is through the State Boards of Regents and Trustees, and it is in the nature of higher education that the Legislature should not interfere directly in such matters. There is no compulsory attendance law for college.

Although it does not seem appropriate now for the Legislature to enter into administrative problems in higher education, it cannot be ignored that the ultimate appeal of the people is to the Legislature, within the limits of the Constitution.

In 1960, through the Donahoe Act, more popularly known as the Master Plan for Higher Education, the Legislature established a guideline for entrance to the university and state colleges. Together, these institutions have the responsibility for educating the highest one-third of the high school graduating class.

We are presently graduating 200,000 high school seniors annually. In the most recent decade, as shown by Sanders and Palmer, initial enrollment in all higher education has grown from 42 percent of the age group to 54 percent. Their report also shows a current graduation rate (bachelor's degrees) of approximately 15 percent of the group.

In this situation, some of the current problems relating to high class sizes, less personal contact between student and teacher, and others, may be accidental functions of a campus crowded with students who have no real ambition to complete the work for a degree. In the meantime, they add to the impersonality of the campus as long as they stay.

Again, it may be the fault of the individual campus authorities that some unqualified students are admitted, even though they possess the prima facie certification of a high school diploma with high grades.

(For a discussion of the high school diploma, see the final report of the Subcommittee on School Curriculum and Pupil Achievement.)

We note that throughout our hearing, representatives of the University of California invariably referred to their colleagues as "Dr. ____." This may be a small point, but it seems to reflect the changing attitude within academic circles. It would appear that the traditional title of

"Professor ____," which implies a teaching function, is fast disappearing.

Turning to the past actions of administrators in higher education, the committee was unable to discern any substantial programs aimed at creating prestige for the teaching function. The use of teaching assistants in lower division courses has been justified on a cost accounting basis, apparently without much consideration being given to the indirect effect the practice has on full-time faculty assigned to lower division courses.

We note with amazement the extent to which the use of teaching assistants can go, as seen by Orlans (page 71):

> "Many graduate students are simply (and unwillingly) forced to serve. As the chairman of one of the nation's great chemistry departments put it. 'We've come to the point where we're just brutal about it—we tell the students you've *got* to teach.' The obligation is usually for one term, but sometimes one year."

Another significant action of administration is the preparation of annual budgets for submission to the Legislature. It has been the policy of the Legislature in past years not to question the purposes for which funds are requested. However, the university and the state colleges should be aware that the Legislature is not indifferent to these expenditures and their purposes, merely because we choose to respect the independence of the institutions.

As an illustration, we find that the Legislature budgeted some $9.7 million for the university in the 1922–23 biennium. On an annual basis, and revised for 1957–59 price levels, this amounts to an annual appropriation of about $8 million for an enrollment of 14,000 students.

In comparison, the Legislative Analyst reported state support for teaching at the University during 1964–65 at a $45.3 million level—adjusted to about $41 million on the same price index. This amount served some 80,000 students.

Although there is no vast difference in these comparisons on the surface, there appears to be evidence that expenditures on the teaching function have remained stable, while during the same interval, nonfederal expenditures on research alone have risen substantially.

Hence there is every reason for the conclusion that new moneys will be asked for research activities, and the wise professor will prepare himself accordingly.

The committee received a communication from Dr. Frank Kidner of the University of California, subsequent to our hearing in San Francisco. Dr. Kidner supplied us with various statistics shown in Appendix D.

We would point out that in the past four years, the university enrollment has increased some 36.3 percent, while the teaching staff increased 32.7 percent and the research staff increased 38.0 percent.

The differences here may not seem threatening, but we would point out that over a period of years, small percentages grow into large numbers. In the public school system, for instance, a slow erosion of the administrator-teacher ratio has accumulated during the past generation to the point where we now have one certificated person outside the classroom for every seven in it.

All of our observations heretofore seem to lead to but one general conclusion. The total system of higher education has taken on a strikingly different character than it had a generation ago.

A college education is no longer the private preserve of a social stratum or an intellectual elite. The base is much broader and has been supported in the name of greater equality of educational opportunity. Consequently, the small minority of highly gifted students cannot expect the intimate personal associations once common.

Furthermore, the 1965 report of Sanders and Palmer [4] for the State Scholarship Commission advocates even broader participation in higher education through increased scholarships and subsistence payments.

> "It is unmistakable that we have reached a point in the economic and social development of California where the interest of the public requires that secondary and higher education become increasingly available to all sectors of society."

However, we do not think this necessarily implies an abject surrender to the "factory system." We believe that the faculty, trustees, regents, and administrators in higher education can, and should, take dramatic steps to preserve as much of the student-teacher relationship and the respect for classroom teaching as is possible.

Faculty members should realize that as educational opportunity is broadened, their own former elite status is diluted. The flight from teaching to research is no answer. Rather, the committee is impressed by Professor Tussman's [5] approach to individualizing instruction at University of California, Berkeley.

We think the administrators in higher education should give more than lip service to reform in higher education. We think their concern, if it is genuine, should be reflected in proposed budgets which clearly underwrite an emphasis in this direction—even if this means a proportionate reduction in requests for additional research monies.

We have suggested several proposals which we believe would add to the instructional climate without denying the legitimate role of research activity.

First, we urge the regents and the trustees to create financial incentives for outstanding teaching. These should not be limited to one year awards, but should provide the sort of permanent increase such that research activity is relatively less rewarding.

Secondly, we would ask for an entire reexamination of promotion policies. We cannot believe that specific and constant research activity is absolutely a prerequisite of effective teaching. We think Plato would agree, although perhaps not Aristotle.

We think that effectiveness in undergraduate, and even graduate instruction, is reason enough for permanent status, and that departmental personnel policies should make this crystal clear. We do not believe that a list of minor publications is evidence of much more than tenacity.

In this regard, we would urge the faculty and administration to undertake a general review of research activity in an effort to assess quality and to eliminate unnecessary support for academic trivia.

---

[4] Sanders, J. Edward, and Palmer, Hans C., The Financial Barrier to Higher Education in California, Pomona College, Claremont, 1965, 295 pages.

[5] Tussman, Joseph, Select Committee on Education, "Education at Berkeley," University of California, Berkeley, 1966, 228 pages.

We believe the time has arrived for California institutions to ease the rigidity of Ph.D. programs. Since the doctoral dissertation is essentially a practical exercise in research, regardless of topical importance, we think it places an undue emphasis on the mechanics of writing for many prospective teachers. Hence, we believe another degree—perhaps called doctor of arts—would accomplish the end of providing college teachers soundly educated in their field.

We propose two new programs to emphasize the point that the Legislature strongly supports first rate teaching in all segments of higher education. Past testimony of university officials has been to the effect that junior college students who were eligible for entrance to the university as freshmen, but chose to enroll in junior college instead, still do as well or better during their upper division work at the university.

Further, to emphasize that our statewide system of higher education is a true system and not an ad hoc collection of sometimes cooperative, sometimes competitive units, we suggest that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education be directed to draw up a plan for an exchange teacher program among all three segments.

The institution of visiting professorships is well established in higher education, and we see no reason why it cannot or should not be applied to an intrastate system.

We believe such a program would improve the image of junior colleges as they commence to assume the role assigned to them by the master plan. We think that both the state colleges and the university could profit from some of the fine teachers now working in junior colleges.

We think that whether the individual exchange person is basically a classroom teacher or an experienced researcher, he would benefit himself from a year or two of intimate contact with an institution of different emphasis.

Additionally, we believe that the Legislature, itself, should indicate its respect for the college teaching function, particularly as it is less rewarding financially than sponsored research. We have proposed that within their respective institutions, the regents, the Trustees, and local boards of trustees establish additional incentives.

We would propose that the state also initiate a program of Governor's Professors, similar to the English tradition of regius professors in their universities. We think that California can afford a modest investment of perhaps $50,000 in order to attest to the importance we give to classroom instruction.

For all the nostalgia of a day when college professors were essentially classroom instructors, we cannot turn back the clock. Basic and applied research are essential features in a modern economy, and we cannot ignore the fact.

Thus, it becomes a matter of creating greater public and professional respect for teaching, rather then denigration of valid research. We do think there has been an excessive drive for publication, anything, anywhere, any time, and we urge faculty associations to reassess this modern phenomenon.

In the meantime, it behooves us to take practical and visible steps to assure undergraduates that their interests are equally important in the total system of higher education.

SEPARATE VIEWS OF ASSEMBLYMAN LEROY F. GREENE RELATIVE TO THE TUITION ISSUE

I have signed the report because I agree that the tuition-free concept of public higher education in California has many facets that require close study by the Joint Committee on Higher Education. I dissent from other findings, recommendations and statements in the tuition section of the report. The issue of imposing a tuition charge is indeed a major one, as the report states. This is an issue which should be closely looked at by the joint committee: Since it will be so examined this subcommittee should not cloud the subject with philosophical pronouncements.

I wish to make it clear that I cannot support the imposition of tuition at state university and college campuses until the joint legislative study now in progress is concluded.

I dissent from recommendation No. 2 of the subcommittee report which proposes that prior to any future increases in incidental and material and services fees at the state's institutions of higher education that such proposals be submitted to both legislative education committees. Since the proposal would not have any practical effect on the eventual increase in such fees, I see no need for its enactment. With respect to the University of California, I also have grave doubts as to the constitutionality of such a legislative requirement.

The text of the report contains many statements relative to the benefits and burdens of higher education to the students and the state, so-called "foregone earnings" of college students, and the supposed effects of a tuition charge upon, to use the subcommittee's phraseology "the mix of occupational skills." This latter point is particularly troubling to me since I strongly suspect that the "mix of occupational skills" in the United States or even in California for that matter will be largely unaffected no matter what we do relative to tuition. There are thousands of public institutions of higher education in this country. None of them appear to act in concert on matters of student fees or tuition. I doubt very much whether the imposition of tuition by any single state system alone will affect the types of job skills produced.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

STATEMENT OF
ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN L. E. COLLIER

I strongly disagree with the committee's conclusions concerning tuition. And, too, I have reservations about other conclusions reached in the report.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—1965 REGULAR (GENERAL) SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL No. 2830

Introduced by Assemblyman Soto

April 21, 1965

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

An act to add Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 31261) to Division 22 of the Education Code, relating to scholarships, and making an appropriation therefor.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 31261) is added to Division 22 of the Education Code, to read:

CHAPTER 4.5. COLLEGE OPPORTUNITY GRANT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

31261. The Legislature finds and declares that because of financial and home and community environmental conditions numerous high school graduates with the potential for success in college are unable to pursue a higher education or take advantage of present scholarship programs. It further recognizes that to effectively combat the forces which prevent these students from pursuing a higher education different programs

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2830, as introduced, Soto (Ed.). State scholarship grants.

Adds Ch. 4.5 (commencing with Sec. 31261), Div. 22, Ed.C.

Creates a State Competitive Scholarship Program to be known as "College Opportunity Grant Scholarship Program," a pilot demonstration program primarily to provide scholarships to selected needy students who are not able to avail themselves of present state competitive scholarships by the use of conventional selection methods and whose potential for success has been attested to by competent and recognized authorities.

Provides for 250 scholarships for each of the fiscal years, 1966–67, 1967–68, 1968–69, and 1969–70.

Appropriates $60,000 for purposes of administration.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

and methods must be tried. There is hereby created a state competitive scholarship program to be known as the "College Opportunity Grant Scholarship Program." It is the purpose of this program to provide financial assistance for undergraduate study to selected students who are not able to avail themselves of present state competitive scholarships by the use of conventional selection methods, pursuant to Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 31201) of this division, but whose potential for success has been attested to by competent and recognized authorities.

31262. The College Opportunity Grant Scholarship Program shall be a pilot demonstration program to assist students who are disadvantaged, by utilizing experimental methods and subjective judgments as well as conventional selection methods.

31263. The College Opportunity Grant Scholarship Program shall be administered by the State Scholarship Commission.

31264. There shall be available 250 scholarships in each of the fiscal years 1966–67, 1967–68, 1968–69, and 1969–70, and the recipients of such scholarships shall be eligible for renewal of their awards until they have completed an A.B. degree in conformance with the terms prescribed by the State Scholarship Commission, which terms shall not be in conflict with this chapter.

31265. To be eligible for a scholarship under this chapter, a student shall meet all of the following:

(a) Be a student who comes within the requisites specified in Section 31261.

(b) Be in need of financial assistance to attend college under present scholarship requirements as well as in need of assistance for room, board and books.

(c) Have demonstrated good citizenship and character.

(d) Have graduated from high school within one year of the date of his application.

(e) Be a resident of the State of California.

(f) Be a citizen of the United States or have been admitted to permanent residence.

(g) Enroll in a California college accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges as a full-time undergraduate student.

31266. Scholarships awarded under this chapter shall be in amounts not in excess of the cost of tuition, room and board, and books at the college the student will attend. If the student receives a federal scholarship under any act of Congress the amount of the scholarship awarded under this chapter shall be decreased by the amount of the federal scholarship awarded. The California State Scholarship Commission shall contract with a college or colleges in California which are accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for an intensive eight-week college preparatory course prior to the initial enrollment of each student who receives a scholarship. Each student shall as a condition to utilizing his scholarship attend and successfully complete such college pre-

paratory course in conformance with the terms prescribed by the State Scholarship Commission which terms shall not be in conflict with this chapter.

31267. The State Scholarship Commission shall submit to the Legislature at its 1969 Regular Session, and at each regular session thereafter until the program under this chapter is completed, an evaluation of the operation of the College Opportunity Grant Scholarship Program. The commission shall not award any additional scholarships for any fiscal years other than those specified in Section 31264 unless there is specific authorization by the Legislature to continue the awarding of college opportunity grant scholarships pursuant to this chapter.

31268. The commission is hereby authorized to accept and receive any federal funds made available under any act of Congress for purposes of this chapter, and to participate in any federal program under such act of Congress in order to secure such funds. The commission shall assist any person eligible for a scholarship under this chapter to secure or obtain any federal scholarship which a person might be eligible to receive for purposes of this chapter.

SEC. 2. There is hereby appropriated from the General Fund in the State Treasury to the State Scholarship Commission the sum of sixty thousand dollars ($60,000) for the administration of Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 31261) of Division 22 of the Education Code.

o

APPENDIX B

TABLE I

THOSE WHO FALL BELOW REQUIRED FAMILY INCOME UNDER ALTERNATIVE TUITION LEVELS *

A. Parent Supported Students †

University of California

Tuition level	Resident students			Commuter students		
	Family contribution	Required family income‡	Percent unable to pay college costs	Family contribution	Required family income‡	Percent unable to pay college costs
$100	$1,400	$10,000	29	$900	$8,000	36
200	1,500	10,500	32	1,000	8,500	40
300	1,600	11,000	35	1,100	9,000	44
400	1,700	11,250	37	1,200	9,250	46
500	1,800	11,500	38	1,300	9,750	50
600	1,900	12,000	41	1,400	10,000	52

California State Colleges

Tuition level	Resident students			Commuter students		
$100	$1,250	$9,500	37	$800	$7,500	32
200	1,350	10,000	40	900	8,000	37
300	1,450	10,500	44	1,000	8,500	41
400	1,550	10,750	46	1,100	9,000	46
500	1,650	11,000	49	1,200	9,250	48
600	1,750	11,500	52	1,300	9,750	52

* Assuming $1,700 residence cost and $1,200 commuter cost at University of California, and $1,550 residence cost and $1,100 commuter cost at California State Colleges. All estimates are for undergraduates.

† Assuming family contributions toward college cost according to college scholarship service standards for a two-child family and a $400 contribution from the student from summer and term-time earnings.

‡ Net income before taxes. Families below this level have some financial need.

B. Self-Supporting Students

University of California

Tuition level	Resident students		Commuter students	
	Required contribution and income	Percent unable to pay college costs	Required contribution and income	Percent unable to pay college costs
$100	$1,800	10.0	$1,300	2.3
200	1,900	10.5	1,400	2.4
300	2,000	11.0	1,500	3.0
400	2,100	12.0	1,600	3.2
500	2,200	13.0	1,700	3.4
600	2,300	14.0	1,800	3.6

California State Colleges

Tuition level	Resident students		Commuter students	
$100	$1,650	7.5	$1,200	.5
200	1,750	8.0	1,300	.5
300	1,850	8.5	1,400	.5
400	1,950	9.0	1,500	.5
500	2,000	9.0	1,600	.5
600	2,100	9.5	1,700	1.0

Source: "Study of Student Aid in California," Staff of the State Scholarship Commission.

APPENDIX C

TABLE I

LOCATION, GROUPING OF SERVICES AT STATE LEVEL— JUNIOR COLLEGE STAFF VIEWS

(Staff N=1285 from 12 Junior Colleges)

Which of the following arrangements do you favor for California junior colleges?	Number	Percent
1. Continue under the State Board of Education with a reorganization of the Department of Education which would bring together all department services for junior colleges within one administrative agency	132	10.2
2. Continue under the State Board of Education with a special advisory council for junior colleges and a reorganization of the Department of Education which would bring together all department services for junior colleges within one administrative agency	330	25.8
3. Establish a new separate State Board for Junior Colleges with an appropriate professional and clerical staff	589	45.9
4. Other: _____	38	2.9
5. No opinion and blank	196	15.2
Totals	1,285	100.0

Source: Medsker, Leland, L., and Clark, Geo. W., *State-Level Governance of California Junior Colleges*, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, August 1968.

TABLE II

STRUCTURE, COMPOSITION OF STATE AGENCY— CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS' VIEWS

(N=70)

	Number	Percent
STRUCTURE		
Separate agency	51	72.9
Advisory agency	14	20.0
Staff unit (subagency)	5	7.1
	70	100.0
COMPOSITION of a separate board:		
a. All lay, no local board members	3	4.2
All lay, some local board members	36	51.6
Combination of lay and professional	26	37.1
All lay, all local board (write in)	5	7.1
	70	100.0
b. Representation on a separate board from other segments and State Department of Education:		
Yes	18	25.7
No	42	60.0
No opinion	6	8.6
Blank	4	5.7
	70	100.0

TABLE III

ATTITUDES OF TRUSTEES TOWARD STATEWIDE COORDINATION *

Attitudes reported	Percentages favoring
Continue under the State Board of Education and Department of Education as at present	18.15
Continue under the State Board of Education with a reorganization of the Department of Education which would bring together all department services for junior colleges within one administrative agency	35.44
Continue under the State Board of Education with a special advisory board for junior colleges and the present organization of the Department of Education	3.79
Continue under the State Board of Education with a special advisory board for junior colleges and a reorganization of the Department of Education which would bring together all department services for junior colleges within one administrative agency	22.36
Establish a new separate State Board for Junior Colleges with an appropriate professional and clerical staff to serve individual districts	17.31
Other	2.95

* C. K. Sapper, "Selected Social, Economic and Attitudinal Characteristics of Trustees of California's Public Junior Colleges", unpublished doctoral dissertation, U.C., Berkeley, June 1966, pp. 95–96. Chart based on slightly over 70 percent response from sample N of 354.

TABLE IV

SERVICES NEEDED FROM A STATE LEVEL AGENCY— JUNIOR COLLEGE STAFF VIEWS

(N=1285)

To what extent do you consider it desirable that a statewide agency render services such as the following to local junior colleges?		Desirable	Undesirable	No opinion or blank
a. Reporting to the field on junior college problems, practices, and findings from research	*No.*	1,203	31	51
	Pct.	93.6	2.4	3.9
b. Conducting research on junior college problems	*No.*	1,182	48	55
	Pct.	91.9	3.7	4.2
c. Assisting the junior colleges and the appropriate associations in formulating and passing legislation pertaining to junior colleges	*No.*	1,171	56	58
	Pct.	91.0	4.3	4.4
d. Assisting in applying for grants from government agencies and foundations	*No.*	1,120	85	80
	Pct.	87.1	6.6	6.1
e. Consulting on matters pertaining to facilities and plant construction	*No.*	1,018	179	88
	Pct.	79.2	13.9	6.7
f. Consulting on curricular and instructional matters	*No.*	902	292	91
	Pct.	70.1	22.7	7.0
g. Advising on local fiscal matters	*No.*	774	322	189
	Pct.	60.1	25.0	14.6

TABLE V

SERVICES NEEDED FROM A STATE LEVEL AGENCY— CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS' VIEWS

(N=70)

What, if any, services should any state level agency provide?		Yes	No	No opinion or blank
1. Initiate and conduct research on and long range planning for:				
a. Educational media (e.g., TV)	*No.*	60	7	3
	Pct.	85.7	10.0	4.2
b. Facility design	*No.*	47	20	3
	Pct.	67.1	28.5	4.2
c. Curricular innovation	*No.*	56	13	1
	Pct.	80.0	18.5	1.4
d. Faculty recruitment	*No.*	42	23	5
	Pct.	60.0	32.8	7.1
e. Student characteristics	*No.*	53	12	5
	Pct.	75.7	17.1	7.1
f. Administrative structure	*No.*	41	26	3
	Pct.	58.5	37.1	4.2
g. Plant utilization	*No.*	58	8	4
	Pct.	82.8	11.4	5.6
2. Coordinating machinery:				
a. Provide a major channel for articulation	*No.*	70	0	0
	Pct.	100.0	0	0
b. Approve academic calendar	*No.*	14	50	6
	Pct.	20.0	71.4	8.4
c. Become the general reporting agency for junior colleges	*No.*	67	2	1
	Pct.	95.7	2.8	1.4
d. Become an information center on problems and practices	*No.*	67	2	1
	Pct.	95.7	2.8	1.4
e. Become the general spokesman for the California Junior Colleges	*No.*	58	9	3
	Pct.	82.8	12.8	4.2

TABLE VI

VIEWS ON NEEDED SERVICES COMPARED WITH ATTITUDES TOWARD SEPARATE BOARD—CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS

Group 1—favors separate state board
Group 2—favors State Board of Education

		Group 1 (N = 51)			Group 2 (N = 19)		
		Yes	No	O/B†	Yes	No	O/B†
SERVICES							
1. Initiate and conduct research on and long range planning for:							
a. Educational media (e.g., TV)	*No.*	45	5	1	15	2	2
	Pct.	88.2	9.8	1.9	78.9	10.5	10.5
b. Facility design	*No.*	38	12	1	9	8	2
	Pct.	74.5	23.5	1.9	47.3	42.1	10.5
c. Curricular innovation	*No.*	43	7	1	13	6	0
	Pct.	84.3	13.7	1.9	68.4	31.5	0
d. Faculty recruitment	*No.*	32	16	3	10	7	2
	Pct.	62.7	31.3	5.8	52.6	36.8	10.5
e Student characteristics	*No.*	40	7	4	13	5	1
	Pct.	78.4	13.7	7.8	68.4	26.3	5.2
f. Administrative structure*	*No.*	34	14	3	7	12	0
	Pct.	66.6	27.4	5.8	36.8	63.1	0
g. Plant utilization	*No.*	42	5	4	16	3	0
	Pct.	82.3	9.8	7.8	84.2	15.7	0
2. Coordinating machinery:							
a. Provide a major channel for articulation	*No.*	51	0	0	19	0	0
	Pct.	100.0	0	0	100.0	0	0
b. Approve academic calendar	*No.*	12	35	4	2	15	2
	Pct.	23.5	68.6	7.8	10.5	78.9	10.5
c. Become the general reporting agency for junior colleges	*No.*	50	1	0	17	1	1
	Pct.	98.0	1.9	0	89.4	5.2	5.2
d. Become an information center on problems and practices	*No.*	48	2	1	19	0	0
	Pct.	94.1	3.9	1.9	100.0	0	0
e. Become the general spokesman for the California Junior Colleges*	*No.*	47	1	3	11	8	0
	Pct.	92.1	1.9	5.8	57.8	42.1	0

* Note significant differences.
† No opinion, or blank.

TABLE VII

POWERS THAT SHOULD BE VESTED IN A STATE LEVEL AGENCY—JUNIOR COLLEGE STAFF VIEWS

(N=1285)

		Desirable	Undesirable	No opinion or blank
To what extent, if at all, is it desirable that some statewide agency have the responsibility for:				
a. Effecting liaison between junior colleges and other segments of education	*No.*	1,124	108	53
	Pct.	87.4	8.4	4.0
b. Determining minimum qualifications for faculty and administrators	*No.*	936	298	51
	Pct.	72.8	23.1	3.9
c. Setting standards for graduation	*No.*	767	448	70
	Pct.	59.5	[illegible].8	5.4
d. Serving as an official spokesman for junior colleges as a whole	*No.*	665	495	125
	Pct.	51.6	38.5	9.7
e. Setting standards for student personnel services	*No.*	525	613	147
	Pct.	40.8	47.7	11.3
f. Setting probation and retention standards for junior college students	*No.*	490	691	104
	Pct.	38.0	53.7	8.0
g. Approving curricula in local colleges	*No.*	268	969	48
	Pct.	20.8	75.4	3.7
h. Approving the academic calendar	*No.*	266	900	119
	Pct.	20.6	70.0	9.1
i. Approving courses of study in local colleges	*No.*	224	999	62
	Pct.	17.4	77.7	4.8
j. Approving appointments of chief administrators in local colleges	*No.*	178	1,026	81
	Pct.	13.8	79.8	6.2
k. Approving textbooks and teaching materials	*No.*	65	1,182	38
	Pct.	5.0	91.9	2.8

APPENDIX D

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Year	Teaching staff			Research staff	Enrollment
	Total	Junior	Senior		
1965–66	7,428	3,331	4,097	4,148	78,043
1964–65	6,669	3,146	3,523	3,800	70,003
1963–64	6,056	2,816	3,240	3,468	63,288
1962–63	5,597	2,543	3,054	3,005	57,261

Source: University of California.

o

printed in CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF STATE PRINTING
L-1803—100 12-66 1,500